DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 591 CG 014 752

AUTHOR Keierleber, Dennis L.
TITLE Project BORN FREE. Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 5.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Women's Educational Equity Act Program.
PUB DATE Aug 77
GRANT 565AH70023
NOTE 100p.; For related documents see CG 014 753-757 and ED 150 493-495.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Careers; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Field Tests; *Material Development; Participant Satisfaction; Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Sex Stereotypes; Staff Development; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Project BORN FREE

ABSTRACT

BORN FREE is a collaborative effort of university-based counseling psychologists and field-site educators to reduce career-related sex stereotyping in 14 educational institutions, and to broaden the range of career options of women and men. The project focuses on the development of training modules (materials, workshops, and videotapes) for administrators, teachers, counselors, and parents at all educational levels. This report describes the evaluation of the two-week 1977 Summer Institute, a staff development training workshop for educators from the schools and colleges participating in Project BORN FREE. The workshop was designed to provide participants with attitudes, knowledge, and skills to reduce career-related sex stereotyping in their institutions, and to field-test preliminary forms of training materials and videotapes. The report concentrates on evaluation of the workshop model, with sections which describe its characteristics and participants, examine workshop strengths and weaknesses for further revision, and assess impact of the workshops upon the participants. Appendices include results of participant pre- and post-workshop assessment questionnaires and a copy of the workshop schedule. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193591

Project BORN FREE

L. Sunny Hansen, Director

EVALUATION OF THE 1977 BORN FREE SUMMER INSTITUTE:

A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping

by

Dennis L. Keierleber

Technical Report Number 5

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tyra Sidberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GRANT # 56-5-AH-70023

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology
Department of Psychoeducational Studies
College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

August, 1977

CG 014 752

OCT 6 1980

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	WORKSHOP CHARACTERISTICS	2
	Objectives	2
	Participant Selection	3
	Workshop Staff	4
	Workshop Materials	5
	Workshop Activities	6
III.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	8
	Pre-Workshop Assessment Questionnaire	9
	Post-Workshop Assessment Questionnaire	10
	Data Analysis	11
IV.	RESULTS	12
	Pre-Workshop Assessment	12
	Post-Workshop Assessment	21
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	36
	Conclusions	36
	Recommendations	40
	REFERENCES	45
	APPENDIX A: TABLES	46
	APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP SCHEDULE	80

I. Introduction

Project BORN FREE is a training and development grant to broaden the range of career options of both women and men. Funded through the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, U.S. Office of Education, the program aims to create career development training modules (materials, workshops, and ten videotapes) for administrators, teachers, counselors, and parents at all educational levels, kindergarten through higher education. The shortened title of Project BORN FREE is an acronym that expresses what the project is about. Build Options, Reassess Norms, Free Roles through Educational Equity.

The 14 schools and higher education institutions participating in the project include an elementary, junior high, and senior high school from each of three school districts; one public vocational technical institute; two community colleges; one private liberal arts college; and the liberal arts college of a state university.

Teams of teachers/professors and counselors/student personnel workers have been named in each setting to identify needs and assess the existence of career-related sex-role stereotyping in the institutions. The project also includes a university-based staff, primarily faculty and graduate students of the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology program at the University of Minnesota. Together, the institutional teams and University staff produced the training materials for field testing in a local BORN FREE Summer Institute in 1977. The materials and workshop model will be further tested at a national institute during Summer, 1978.

This report describes the evaluation of the two week 1977 Summer Institute. The Institute was a staff development training workshop for

educators from the schools and colleges participating in Project BORN FREE. Educators from other institutions, primarily local, also attended the workshop. The workshop served two general purposes: a) to provide participants with the attitudes, knowledge, and skills to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions; and b) to field test the preliminary forms of the training materials and videotapes. During the workshop participants were exposed to a variety of didactic presentations and experiential activities. Trainees also developed action plans for implementing changes in their home institutions.

Because the Institute was the first field test of the workshop model and the training materials, the evaluative focus was primarily formative. This report concentrates upon evaluation of the workshop model; assessment of specific learning materials and videotapes is the subject of a separate project evaluation report. The following sections describe the characteristics of the workshop and participants, examine workshop strengths and weaknesses for further revision, and assess the workshop's impact upon the participants.

II. Workshop Characteristics

Objectives

The Project Director developed six general objectives to orient the learning activities of workshop participants. As a result of the workshop, participants were to:

1. Increase their awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-roles and of the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options;

2. Experience a content/process model of inservice training which they can adapt in developing their own implementation plans;

3. Increase their knowledge of programs and change process through which they can reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions;

4. Expand their concept of career development education to include education, occupation, and lifestyle options in a developmental framework;

5. Develop ways to increase the involvement of parents, students, and community to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions; and

6. Become familiar with efforts of business and industry to develop personnel strategies for opening career options for women and men.

Participant Selection

Descriptive application brochures for the BORN FREE Summer Institute were distributed by project field site staff at their institutions beginning approximately four months prior to the workshop. The method of distribution was determined by the field site staff members. The Project Director and Assistant Director began selection of the 40 participants, approximately two months prior to the workshop, according to the following criteria:

1. Team participation of counselors, teachers, and administrators from all educational levels;

2. A balance of both sexes, as much as possible;

3. Commitment to the goals of the BORN FREE program;

4. Past experience in career development and in instituting innovative programs; and

5. Commitment to attend a full-day retreat and all workshop sessions.

The original intent for participant selection was to choose two to three persons, a combination of counselor, instructor, and/or administrator, from each of the 14 project institutions. Because of prior summer school teaching assignments, pending staff terminations or transfers, and other commitments, staff interest in attending the workshop varied considerably among project

institutions. Therefore, the first and second selection criteria were relaxed somewhat. Because of the visibility of the project in the community, several educators from institutions other than the original 14 expressed interest in attending the workshop. Participants were selected from this group to fill remaining vacancies in the weeks prior to the beginning of the workshop.

All participants were awarded a stipend for tuition, books, and student fees. Participants received six graduate-level credits for completion of the workshop. A few participants, such as those with doctorate degrees, attended the workshop without accepting the graduate-credit incentive.

Workshop Staff

The workshop staff included the Project Director and another professor from the University's Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology program. They were responsible for a major portion of the lecture material presented to workshop participants. Six part-time Project Assistants facilitated small group activities, provided general assistance for workshop conduct, and also made several presentations to workshop participants. Two part-time evaluators coordinated all evaluation procedures, and a part-time media specialist was responsible for videotape viewing activities of workshop participants. The Project Assistants, Evaluators, and Media Specialist all were either Masters-level counseling psychologists or graduate students in counseling psychology or education.

During the course of the workshop, the staff as a group met twice weekly to provide feedback on workshop conduct, discuss problem areas and schedule modifications, and refine plans for further activities. Additional informal meetings were scheduled as needed by staff members during the two-week period.

Workshop Materials

The major materials for the workshop included two components of the career development training materials produced by the Project BORN FREE staff: the learning or module activities and the videotapes. The module activities are structured group exercises to facilitate self-exploration and assessment of participants' beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge of sex-role socialization and stereotyping related to career development. The module activites were revised several times and completed for initial field testing shortly before the beginning of the workshop. The use of the module activities in the workshop familiarized participants with the materials for future applications in their home institutions, facilitated self-exploration of participants' knowledge and attitudes, and provided evaluative feedback for further revision of the materials. From the 200 activities developed, Project Assistants selected approximately 20 exemplary activities for inclusion in the workshop.

The original proposal of Project BORN FREE called for the completion and field testing of ten half-hour videotapes concerning different aspects of career development and sex-role socialization for use in the workshop. Because of the large amount of time required to produce and edit each planned tape, only one videocassette, an overview of Project BORN FREE, was completed for inclusion in the workshop. As an alternative plan, workshop participants viewed portions of the 50 to 60 hours of unedited videotapes filmed for the project. These viewings served an instructional purpose for workshop participants. At the same time, participants reviewed the videotapes and identified those segments they perceived as the most powerful and relevant statements for the planned themes of the nine remaining videotapes. The media specialist developed a schedule to maximize viewing

of as many tapes as possible by different participants over the two-week period.

Workshop Activities

Appendix B includes the schedule of workshop activities. During the second week of the workshop, minor changes were made in the time allotments and content of some activities based upon participants' suggestions from the first week. Major categories of activities are summarized below to assist in the later explanation of the evaluation results.

Retreat. A full day retreat was included on the Saturday prior to the beginning of the two weeks of classroom sessions. The retreat was designed for participants to become acquainted with one another, the project, and the project staff. The program included an overview presentation of the project, several group process exercises, and unscheduled periods for participant and staff recreation and interaction.

Lectures. Lectures were presented on such topics as a conceptual framework for career development, group process guidelines for workshop leaders, and a review of the literature on career-related sex-role stereotyping.

Exemplary programs. Reports on methods and problems of implementing institutional change were presented by staff from project institutions and directors of state and local projects to reduce sex-biased practices in educational institutions.

Module activities. Some module activity exercises were conducted with the total group of workshop participants. Other exercises formed the basis for interaction in the Developmental Growth Groups described below. Participants also were assigned a set of activities to briefly review and evaluate for technical quality and feasibility of use in their home institutions.

Developmental Growth Groups. Small discussion groups of the same six to eight persons met almost daily with a Project Assistant as group facilitator. A module activity exercise was completed as a starting point for group discussion

of their personal attitudes and feelings concerning career-related sex-role stereotyping.

Videotape viewing. Videotape viewing included the review and evaluation of the unedited tapes by teams of workshop participants. As a group, participants viewed the project overview tape, "A World of Options." Participants also viewed two videotapes, a men's support group and a women's support group, of persons discussing their career development. The men's tape was unedited material; the women's tape was produced previously by the Project Director for a different project.

Business/industry visit. Small groups of three to four participants visited for one afternoon a cooperative local business or industry concern. Participants inquired about the company's policies, programs, and problems regarding career options for women and men. Participants shared with the total workshop group the results of these visits.

Implementation plan. Groups of participants from the same institution met over the two-week period to develop action plans for implementing programs in their institutions to ultimately broaden the career opportunities of students. These plans were shared with other workshop participants on the final day of classes and given to the Project Director as a course requirement.

Journal reflections. Each workshop participant recorded in a journal at the end of each class day the person's thoughts, reactions, and perceptions based upon the day's activities and experiences. Project Assistants reviewed the journals at the end of each week, made written comments, and returned the journals to the participants.

Readings. Two texts were assigned for reading during the workshop. A number of other relevant materials were available for participants to read as desired.

III. Evaluation Methodology

Several considerations influenced the design chosen to evaluate the BORN FREE Summer Institute. One major evaluative concern was the changes in workshop participants' attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions. As part of the application procedure, participants prepared a statement describing their experience in programs for staff and educational development, career development, and reducing sex bias or sex-role stereotyping. The selected group included a number of persons with apparently extensive backgrounds and interest in these areas. Most standardized sex-role attitude surveys reviewed appeared to have high face validity among items, a high potential for eliciting socially desirable responses, and, as a result, a low probability for identifying meaningful changes among these participants during the workshop.

A second concern was for changes in participants, not only in their attitudes toward sex-roles, but especially in their attitudes, confidence, and abilities to function as change agents in their institutions. Havelock (1973) provides useful definitions of "planned change" and "change agent" as intended for Project BORN FREE. Planned change refers to "change or innovation which comes about through a deliberate process which is intended to make both acceptance by and benefit to the people who are changed more likely" (p. 5). A change agent is "a person who facilitates planned change or planned innovation" (p. 5). As an outcome of the workshop, participants were expected to be better equipped to implement programs to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions.

A third consideration was maximizing the amount of information obtained from participants on a variety of subjects in the limited amount of time allotted for evaluation, both at the beginning and end of the workshop. Because of their length and content, the standardized instruments available were neither feasible

nor appropriate for evaluating the workshop. Time limitations also precluded administration of any extensive tests of knowledge.

Pre-workshop and post-workshop assessment questionnaires, therefore, were developed to describe and assess a wide range of characteristics of the workshop and its participants. Basic question formats included both single item questions with participant responses on a Likert scale (objective) and open-ended questions (subjective).

Pre-Workshop Assessment Questionnaire

This questionnaire was administered to all workshop participants during a 30 minute period at the beginning of the first day of classes. Participants were informed that all responses were confidential and would be referred to only by a code number. The questionnaire included four sections.

Participant characteristics. Participants provided demographic and occupational information, such as their employing institution, position, age, sex, and educational level. Participants also were asked to indicate the number of years they had been employed as an educator, in their current position, in their current institution, and if they anticipated any change of their current employment situation in the near future.

Previous activities and experience. Participants indicated on a Likert scale how frequently they participated in Project BORN FREE activities during the 1976-1977 academic year. They estimated how often they had participated in and coordinated programs involving staff development, education development/improvement, career development, and sex-role stereotyping. Participants also rated how knowledgeable they considered themselves in these four areas. As an overall assessment of participants' current knowledge, skills, and confidence as change agents, they also estimated how experienced they were in coordinating programs in each of the four areas.

Applications of workshop experience. It was anticipated that workshop par-

ticipants would have different initial expectations of how they planned to use the skills and knowledge acquired from the workshop. From a change agent approach, one concern was how important it was to participants to effect changes in different target groups. Therefore, participants indicated the importance to themselves of applying their workshop training to foster changes in themselves, their students, their colleagues, their institutions' policies and programs, and parents.

Perceptions of career development, sex-role stereotyping, and institutional change. The fourth section asked participants' agreement or disagreement with statements describing themselves; their institutions' programs, staff, and students; and their expectations of implementing institutional change; all with regard to career development and sex-role stereotyping. A number of questions were developed from a conceptual model created by the Rand Corporation for a nationwide study of implementing innovative change programs in educational institutions (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975). An adaptation of this model serves as the framework for examination of the change process in the 14 project institutions.

Post-Workshop Assessment Questionnaire

This questionnaire was administered to all workshop participants during a 75 minute period at the end of the last day of classes. It consisted of seven sections.

Attainment of objectives. To assess how well the workshop met its six stated objectives, participants rated on a Likert scale the degree to which the workshop provided information and experiences to attain each objective. Participants also indicated how much they learned with regard to each objective, a measure which somewhat accounted for existing knowledge of participants prior to the workshop and new knowledge gained. Participants also rated the personal importance of each objective, a relative indication of whether the workshop met

participant needs. Subjective comments concerning each objective were requested for the latter two questions.

Knowledge outcomes. Participants were requested to estimate once again how knowledgeable they considered themselves in the areas of staff development, educational development/improvement, career development, and sex-role stereotyping.

Applications of workshop experience. This series of questions was repeated to assess changes, if any, in participants' priorities for application of their workshop-acquired knowledge and skills to different target populations.

Perceptions of career development, sex-role stereotyping and institutional change. This set of statements likewise was repeated from the pre-workshop assessment to ascertain attitudinal changes among participants concerning the different topics covered. Some items referring to previous programs and attitudes of staff and students at participants' home institutions were not repeated. These items referred to historical or "fixed" situations that could not or were unlikely to change during the two-week period.

Workshop activities. Participants provided objective ratings of how useful each workshop activity was for themselves, following the schedule outline in Appendix B. Subjective comments regarding each activity also were requested.

Open-ended questions. The participants responded to ten open-ended questions regarding changes in their attitudes, knowledge, and skills as a result of the workshop; personal gains, unanticipated gains, and unfulfilled expectations from the workshop; major satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the workshop; recommendations to improve workshop effectiveness; and participants' needs for future assistance from Project BORN FREE.

Overall value of workshop. As a summary item, participants were asked to rate from "Very Poor" to "Excellent" the overall personal value of the workshop.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were computed for all

items with objective response categories. Frequency distributions are selectively presented in the text. A T-test for paired samples was used to compare mean response scores for those objective items repeated at pre- and post-workshop assessments. Because of the exploratory nature of the evaluation, a p-value of .10 or less (2-tailed) is considered statistically significant for this report. Responses to open-ended questions were categorized and summary descriptive statements were prepared for major response themes.

Concerning limitations of the analysis, an experimental control group was not employed for comparative purposes. Therefore, differences between pre- and post-workshop assessment scores technically do not mean that the workshop "caused" the differences, only that a change had taken place over the two-week period. However, responses to questions inquiring about the effects of the workshop upon participants offer corroborative support that changes may be attirubted to the workshop. Although test-retest reliability indices were not obtained for objective items, consistency of responses to different types of questions concerning similar aspects of the workshop provides convergence for the validity of the results described.

IV. Results

Pre-Workshop Assessment

Participant characteristics. Workshop participants were asked a number of questions about personal characteristics, educational backgrounds and experiences, and expectations for the future. This information provides a general description of those who attended the workshop and a background for explication of participant responses to later questions.

The 40 workshop participants represented 19 different institutions: 3 elementary and 7 secondary schools; 1 vocational-technical institute; 1 liberal arts college; 2 community colleges; 2 state universities; and 2 schools with combined

elementary-secondary grade levels (e.g. K-12). In all, 45 percent (N=18) of the participants came from post-secondary level institutions; 22.5 percent (N=9), secondary schools; 25 percent (N=10), elementary schools; and 7.5 percent (N=3), combined-grade schools. One community college had eight staff members, or 20 percent of the total group, in attendance.

Of the three major educator groups, instructors were most represented, 24 persons (60%). Administrators and counselors were equally represented with six persons (15%) each. Most participants, as intended, came from institutions that had participated in Project BORN FREE during the previous year. Only seven persons (17.5%) were from nonparticipating institutions.

Slightly less than two-thirds (65%, N=26) of the participants were women. Females comprised a greater number of elementary and secondary educators; 17 women compared to five men. The post-secondary level educators included a more balanced representation, nine men and nine women. The median age of the group was 33.0 years. Half the group (N=20) had earned a bachelors as their highest degree; 42.5% (N=17) had earned graduate credits beyond a master's degree, including two doctorates.

Most participants had several years experience as educators, with a median of 7.3 years. Most participants also had been employed in their current institutions for several years, a median of 4.3 years, though the range spanned 0 years for a person newly transferred to different school to 12 years for a community college administrator. In general, the majority of participants had been in their institutions long enough to assume they had a thorough knowledge of their systems.

Sixty percent (N=24) of the participants indicated a possible change of position in the next two years. For at least half of these persons (N=12) the anticipated move would be out of their current institution. This situation may have some bearing upon strategies for long range change efforts in the institu-

tions affected.

Previous activities and experiences. Participants were asked several questions to determine the general level of knowledge, skills, and experience they possessed prior to the workshop. The first set of questions referred to their previous participation in and leadership of programs related to several training goal areas of the workshop. Table 1-A[a] summarizes participant responses for these questions. Participants responded on a six-point scale from "not at all" (coded "1") to "very often" (coded "6"). Although most workshop members came from institutions that participated in Project BORN FREE during the previous year, only a few persons were involved to any extent in activities conducted by the field site staff at those institutions (item 1); the mean participation response was 2.23 (SD=1.51), or slightly more than "once in a while." Only six persons (15%) responded that they had participated "often" ("fairly," "quite," or "very") in Project BORN FREE-related activities. However, as might be expected, the group had greater participatory experience in staff development/inservice training and educational improvement programs (items 2 and 3), the latter reflecting educational change and innovation efforts. These two questions were asked to assess whether participants had at least some exposure to general program formats and methods that might be used to implement similar Project BORN FREE-related programs in their institutions. Participants also had limited previous involvement in programs related to career development and to sex-role stereotyping (items 4 and 5). To both questions, 75 percent (N=30) responded that they had participated at least "once in a while" in programs on either topic, but only a few persons reported that they had participated "quite often" or "very often" in programs on career development (N=5, 12.5%) or sex-role stereotyping (N=3, 7.5%).

Coordination or leadership of such programs was evident but also limited.

---

[a] All tables referred to are included in Appendix A.

As indicated in Table 1-A (items 6, 7, 8, and 9) the mean responses indicate participants had coordinated programs little more than "once in a while," and even less for programs on sex-role stereotyping. Fifty-five percent (N=22) of the participants had never coordinated a program on career development; 65 percent (N=26) had never coordinated a program on sex-role stereotyping.

Participants also estimated how knowledgeable they considered themselves in these areas (Table 2-A). Persons responded on a seven-point scale from "not at all" (coded "1") to "extremely" (coded "7"). On the average, participants considered themselves at least "somewhat" knowledgeable about the topics of staff development/inservice training (item 1) and career development (item 3), although no person responded that they were "very" or "extremely" knowledgeable on the topic of career development. Participants reported higher mean ratings for knowledge of improving education (item 2) and sex-role stereotyping (item 4), although no one responded that they were "extremely" knowledgeable about the topic of sex-role stereotyping.

To obtain an overall measure of participants' self-perceptions of their expertise as program coordinators prior to the workshop, they were asked to indicate how experienced they were at coordinating programs in the four different areas (items 5, 6, 7, and 8). As might be expected from previous responses, the group members' average perceptions of themselves as experienced program coordinators were fairly low, from only "slightly" to less than "somewhat" experienced. The following percentage of participants rated themselves either "not at all" or "slightly" experienced for the four areas: staff development/inservice training, 62.5 percent (N=25); educational improvement, 47.5 percent (N=19); career development, 60 percent (N=24); and sex-role stereotyping, 75 percent (N=30).

Although some persons rated themselves high in these categories, the group of participants, as a whole, began the workshop with fairly frequent previous participation in general educational programs, such as staff development and

educational improvement, but more limited participation in career development and sex-role stereotyping programs, as well as previous Project BORN FREE activities. Participant experience in coordinating educational change programs also was limited, especially in the area of sex-role stereotyping. The participants considered themselves moderately knowledgeable about educational improvement and sex-role stereotyping. The latter self-assessment possibly was based upon personal rather than professional experience, given the lower mean response scores to questions concerning formal program participation and coordination. Participants also did not strongly perceive themselves as experienced program coordinators although mean ratings were somewhat higher for general educational programs than for career development and, especially, sex-role stereotyping programs.

Application of workshop experience. Another concern about participants was who were their intended target groups for change, those that might limit the career options of students? Who did they desire to change through application of the attitudes, skills, and knowledge acquired from the workshop? Participants were asked to indicate the personal importance they placed upon effecting changes in different target groups that may be limiting student career options in their institutions. Persons responded to the items in Table 3-A on a seven-point scale from "not at all important" (coded "1") to "extremely important" (coded "7"). As the mean score of 6.03 (SD=1.10) indicates (item 1), participants considered applying what they learned to change themselves as most important. Effecting changes in their students was almost equally important (item 2), with a mean response of 5.97 (SD=1.06). Change of colleagues (item 4) and the policies and practices of participants' institutions (item 3) obtained lower mean ratings, but both were still considered at least "quite important." Change of parents' attitudes, values, and behaviors (item 5) elicited the lowest mean response. This pattern might reflect dimensions of professional responsibility or influence. Participants have the most responsibility for and influence over their own be-

haviors and attitudes. They also have more responsibility for and influence upon their students than their colleagues, institutions' policies, and, least of all, parents.

Perceptions of career development, sex-role stereotyping, and institutional change. Another area of interest was participants' views of themselves, of their institutions, and of institutional change with regard to career development and sex-role stereotyping. Participants indicated how much they agreed with the 38 statements presented in Table 4-A. Response categories included a seven-point scale from "strongly disagree" (coded "1") to "strongly agree" (coded "7").

Several items (items 1, 2, 3, amd 4) were asked about the extent to which participants perceived their institutions as encouraging both sex-stereotyped roles and broadened career options for students. Both types of questions were asked because it was hypothesized that persons might respond differently to the positive or negative connotations of the terms used and that the two statements are somewhat independent. Reference to male and female students separately also was considered an important differentiation. Mean responses for items 1 and 2 indicated "slight" agreement that institutional practices encouraged sex-stereotyped roles for both male and female students, respectively, although agreement was greater regarding female students. Participants also were more likely to agree that their institutions encouraged broadened career options for male students (item 3) than for female students (item 4), though over one-fifth (20.5%, N=8) of the participants responded "disagree" to item 3.

Another set of statements was designed to assess whether career-related sex-role stereotyping was a fairly "blatant" problem in participants' institutions and whether participants perceived a strong need for programs to counter limits to student career options. Participants, as a group, tended to agree that practices limiting career options for female students (item 6) were more evident in their institutions than for male students (item 5); 14 persons (35.9%) responded

to the three "agree" categories for male students, while 25 persons (64.1%) responded to the same categories for female students. Most participants agreed to some extent that there was a "real need" for programs in their institutions to counter limits to career options for both male (item 7) and female (item 8) students; again, there was a greater endorsement of the three agreement categories regarding female students (N=37, 94.9%) than for male students (N=31, 79.5%).

To assess their anticipations about the utility of the training and materials they were to receive from the workshop, participants responded to three statements concerning the expected helpfulness of the knowledge (item 9), materials (item 10), and skills (item 11) to be acquired for effecting changes in their institutions. Mean responses were in agreement with the three statements, indicating some degree of optimism for the workshop since participants had not yet experienced any training activities.

Participants answered another set of statements to assess their own awareness of sex bias and the influence of sex-role stereotyping on women and men comparatively in career decision-making. Almost all persons agreed to some extent (94.9%, N=37) that they felt they could recognize sex bias and stereotyping when they encountered it in their job (item 12). The identical percentage and number agreed to some degree that they felt they were aware of how sex-role stereotyped practices affected student career decisions (item 13). There was somewhat less mean agreement, but still positive, concerning participant awareness of others perceiving participants' behaviors as sex biased (item 14). On the average, participants agreed that men were less concerned about sex-role stereotyping in career decisions than were women (item 15), but participants were more likely to disagree that sex-role stereotyping was less of a problem for men than women in career decisions (item 16).

Participants were presented with several statements about the support and long range concern among their institutions' staff and adminstrators for reducing

career-related sex-role stereotyping practices. Their institutions' previous sponsorship of programs in these areas was another concern. Over three-fourths (76.9%, N=30) agreed at some level that their institutions had actively supported career development activities in the past (item 18), but there was less average agreement that similar active sponsorship was given to programs on sex bias problems (item 17).

Although career development apparently had been a curricular concern in some of the participants' institutions (item 19), 33.4 percent (N=13) of the group disagreed to some degree with this statement. Most participants responded that their institutions to some extent were open to new programs that benefited students (item 20), resulting in a mean agreement score of 4.67 (SD=1.71). As a group, participants tended to be more positive about administrative support (item 21) than colleagues' support (item 22) to reduce sex-role stereotyping in their institutions. However, a long range concern for such change was less evident among administrators (item 23) and even less among participants' colleagues (item 24).

Students at participants' institutions were not considered fairly aware of the sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit their career options (item 25) and apparently were even less concerned about such practices (item 26). Only six persons (15.4%) agreed with this latter item.

Another series of statements tapped participants' expectations about implementing change in their institutions. Persons were fairly optimistic that a number of changes could be made in the next year to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions (item 27); 34 participants (87.2%) responded at least "slightly agree." As a group, participants also were likely to agree there was some personal risk in attempting to make changes in their institution, slightly more so regarding sex-role stereotyping problems (item 28) than career development concerns (item 29).

In addition to the personal risk involved, another factor associated with change is disruption of the existing institutional organization. Mean agreement responses about the amount of disruption required were almost equal for reducing sex-role stereotyping practices (item 30; $\bar{X}$=4.36, SD=1.48) and expanding career development practices (item 31; $\bar{X}$=4.41, SD=1.62).

Other problems facing educators in their attempts to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping are the potential competing influences of parents as socialization agents and the length of the students' socialization histories reinforcing traditional male-female roles. Less than half (N=18, 46.1%) agreed (item 32) that institutional interventions would have very limited effects in countering parental influences that channeled students toward traditional male-female career roles. Most participants (N=27, 69.3%) disagreed to some degree (item 33) that interventions at their educational level, whether post-secondary, secondary, or elementary, would have a very limited influence upon redirecting a student from a chosen traditional male-female career role.

Participants' expectations of the effort required to implement changes in their institutions also were important variables. Participants tended to agree that quite an effort would be required to expand institutional practices for career development (item 35) and even more effort to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices (item 34).

Workshop participants also agreed that time demands upon staff in their institutions would limit implementation of any change activities (item 36). A lesser number of persons, but still over half (N=21, 53.8%), indicated (item 37) that the institution's economic situation also would limit activities.

A final concern was the extent to which the graduate-level credits offered played a role in participants' attendance at the workshop (item 38). Although the mean agreement response was slightly less than "neither agree nor disagree," or 3.92, the standard deviation of 2.11 indicates the wide variation of responses

to this item. The majority of participants (N=23, 51.2%) responded with some level of agreement to the statement. However a greater number of participants "strongly disagreed" (N=7, 17.9%) than "strongly agreed" (N=3, 7.7%), accounting for the lower mean response. Thus, the credit incentive did, to some degree, influence the decisions of a majority of participants to attend the workshop.

Post-Workshop Assessment

Attainment of objectives. To determine how well the workshop met its objectives, participants rated each objective statement following three sets of instructions. First, participants were asked how much provision was made in the workshop to attain each objective. Responses were made on a seven-point scale from "none" (coded "1") to "a great amount" (coded "7"). Table 5-A summarizes mean responses for the six stated objectives (items 1 through 6). Participants reported the most provision was made for the first objective (item 1), increasing awareness of one's own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex roles and the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options. For five of the six objectives, participants indicated a mean response that "much" to "very much" provision was made. The lowest mean provision rating was for the last objective (item 6), concerning familiarization with business and industry efforts to increase women's and men's career options. This result most likely reflects the limited amount of time devoted to this activity, relative to other activities.

Participants further were asked how much they had learned with regard to each objective (Table 6-A). Responses were coded on a seven-point scale from "nothing" (coded "1") to "a great amount" (coded "7"). Based upon mean responses, participants said they learned most about programs and processes to reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions (item 3). Although, as indicated in Table 5-A, participants indicated the most provision had been made for increasing self-awareness (the first objective), there was a lower corresponding mean rating of what was learned (item 1). A number of participants commented

they already had knowledge in this area prior to the workshop:

> "I already was quite aware of how sex-role socialization and career options are related."
>
> "My background was already quite extensive. I've done a lot of thinking about this for the past 5 years."

The lower mean ratings for the fifth (item 5) and sixth (item 6) objectives partially reflected the limited content presented in these areas. For example, regarding increasing parent, student, and community involvement in change efforts (item 5), participants commented:

> "Getting involvement of parents and more students in workshop would have been beneficial."
>
> "We didn't hear as much about parents, and students -- mostly staff."

Concerning business and industry efforts (item 6), a typical response of a person who learned only a "moderate" amount in this area was:

> "Would be very worthwhile to have more than one visit. The sharing of experiences was very good but not as good as experiencing it yourself!"

Finally, for a general assessment of whether participants gained from the workshop those things they considered important, they were asked to rate how important each objective was for themselves. Responses were coded on a seven-point scale from "not at all" (coded "1") to "extremely" (coded "7") important. As the mean responses for items 1 through 6 in Table 7-A indicate, the participants placed a fairly high level of importance on all objectives. Self-awareness (item 1) was clearly most important; all but one person (N=39, 97.5%) rated this objective either "very" or "extremely" important. As one person commented:

> "Gotta know where I am, who I am and how I am before I can see where I need and/or want to go. Seeing where I've been is very useful and helpful."

Knowledge of programs and change process (item 3) was also considered of high importance with a mean response of 5.90 (SD=1.06). Compared to the amount of workshop provision made and the amount learned by participants, the fifth objec-

tive (item 5) received a fairly high mean importance rating. Participants considered this area one of concern but also one with lesser attention given to it in the workshop. In general, the workshop provided for and participants learned about those areas participants considered most important. The area of parent, student, and community involvement might be one for greater emphasis in future workshops; however, recognizing the interests of future workshop groups probably will vary. Business and industry efforts for change also might be given additional focus.

Knowledge outcomes. Comparisons were made of participants' self-estimates of knowledge, before and after the workshop, in the areas of staff development/inservice training, educational improvement, career development, and sex-role stereotyping. Response categories were on a seven-point scale from "not at all" (coded "1") to "extremely" (coded "7") knowledgeable. Table 8-A (items 1, 2, 3, and 4) summarizes these comparisons. Significant gains, at the p=.01 level or less, were made in all areas. The greatest mean increases were in knowledge of career development (item 3; mean gain=1.36, SD=1.25) and sex-role stereotyping (item 4; mean gain=1.87, SD=1.42), the two specialized content areas of the workshop. Thus, participants considered that their knowledge had increased substantially over the two-week workshop period.

Application of workshop experiences. A comparison also was made of the personal importance participants placed upon applying what they learned in the workshop to change different target groups. One general hypothesis of interest was that as a result of the workshop, participants would broaden the scope of their concerns for change to include groups other than themselves and their students. Responses were coded on a seven-point scale from "not at all" (coded "1") to "extremely" (coded "7") important. As Table 9-A indicates, no significant changes in participant ratings took place. Participants still considered change of themselves (item 1) as most important in countering limits to student career

options, followed by change of their students (item 2). Change of their colleagues (item 4) and institution's policies and programs (item 3) formed the next level of priority. Change of parents was last (item 5) and dropped, though not significantly, in importance.

It appears participants consider changing those situations in their professional settings of greatest importance, as indicated by the mean ratings of at least "quite" important for items 1 through 4. Within these settings, again, those areas over which participants exercise the greatest responsibility and influence apparently take precendence.

Perceptions of career development, sex-role stereotyping, and institutional change. Over the two-week period, did participants change any of their views on the subjects about which they were asked at the beginning of the workshop? Table 10-A summarizes the differences between participants' mean agreement ratings for 27 statements at pre- and post-workshop assessments. Response categories followed the seven-point scale of "strongly disagree" (coded "1") to "strongly agree" (coded "7"). Concerning the extent to which participants perceived problems in their institution and a need for programs to increase student career options (items 1 through 8), changes in participants' mean agreement rating to statements about male students were evident. There were significant increases in agreement that participants' institutions encourage sex-stereotyped roles for male students (item 1, p=.001) and that practices limiting male students' career options are fairly evident in the institutions (item 5, p=.08). These changes may reflect participants' review of their institutions' policies and programs, as part of the implementation plan development, over the two-week period. Coupled with new knowledge about the effects of sex-role stereotyping on male career options, participants may have determined specific career-limiting practices toward male students in their institutions. The response changes also may reflect simply a general increase in knowledge that institutional prac-

tices can limit male career options as well as female options. In either case, participants were more aware at the end of the workshop that sex-role stereotyping practices, whether specific or general, affect male students in their institutions.

After having experienced the workshop, participants increased or maintained their mean agreement with statements about the helpfulness of the workshop in effecting changes in their institutions (items 9, 10, and 11). Participants' initial expectations of the utility of the workshop were fairly high. These expectations were confirmed by the end of the workshop. The one significant increase in mean agreement responses concerned the utility of the practical skills learned in the workshop (item 11, $p=.05$), although a similar, but nonsignificant, trend was noted for the helpfulness of the knowledge learned (item 9, $p=.11$).

Participants also reported an increase in their awareness of sex-role stereotyping: recognizing it in their jobs (item 12, $p=.02$), being aware of how it affects students' career decisions (item 13, $p=.003$), and being aware of when others might view participants' behaviors as reflecting a sex bias (item 14, $p=.003$). There was no significant change in participants' slight disagreement that sex-role stereotyping is less of a problem for men than women in career decision-making or in their agreement that stereotyping is less of a concern among men than women (item 15) in such decisions.

Participants were equally optimistic before and after the workshop that a number of changes could be made in their institutions in the next year (item 17). They also tended to agree only slightly before and after the workshop that parental influences would be difficult to overcome through institutional interventions (item 18).

There was, however, significantly less mean disagreement among participants that interventions at their educational levels would have very limited effects in changing students' decisions to follow only sex-role stereotyped career op-

tions (item 19, p=.001). A major finding of the workshop literature review presentations on career-related sex-role stereotyping concerned the strength of students' career decisions in the young adult years, at the post-secondary level. Because of the years of socialization a student may have experienced to pursue only traditional male-female occupations, educators experience difficulty in encouraging students to consider nontraditional careers. Given, the workshop participant group was comprised of almost half post-secondary educators, the increased uncertainty reflected in the change of the mean response to this item may indicate a revision of opinion by this subgroup of educators.

By the end of the workshop, participants, as a group, also agreed more strongly that they faced some personal risks in attempting to implement institutional changes in the area of career development (item 21, p=.07) and, especially, the area of sex-role stereotyping (item 20, p=.003). Several of the workshop speakers on illustrative change agent programs described the resistances, political problems, and professional threats encountered in attempting organized programs to reduce sex-role stereotyping in general and in vocatinal education programs. The message of these presentations is a likely influential factor in the change of participants' mean responses to these statements.

Compared with initial responses, participants responded at the close of the workshop with a slightly greater, but nonsignificant, level of mean agreement concerning the amount of disruption (items 22 and 23) and effort (items 24 and 25) required to make changes in their institutions. There also were no significant pre-post differences in participant perceptions of the effects of time demands (item 26) and economic situations (item 27) in their institutions upon limiting possible change activities.

Workshop activities. To assess the strengths, weaknesses, and overall effectiveness of specific workshop activities, participants rated the usefulness of each workshop activity or presentation. Response options, on a seven-point

scale, were from "not at all" (coded "1") to "extremely" (coded "7") useful. Participants also were asked for subjective comments. Table 11-A summarizes mean responses and standard deviations for various types of activities.

The Saturday retreat was fairly highly regarded by participants with all mean responses (items 1, 2, and 3) between "quite" and "very" useful. As one person commented to item 1:

> "Being introduced to the workshop in this method facilitated the entire workshop in that we never would have made the progress we did in this short time had we started from scratch that first Monday."

Comparatively, participants considered the free time at the retreat slightly more useful than the group process activities.

Mean responses to the different didactic or lecture presentations varied (items 4 through 9). The presentation on a career development conceptual framework had the highest mean rating (5.39, SD=1.29). The presentation provided an overview for the program and was well accepted by participants as such, though participants varied in their grasp of the material:

> "Excellent basic material needed for orientation to the workshop. Could have been passed out and used with overhead, particularly because it was covered so fast and was so important;" or
>
> "We must know the basics of the program, but it doesn't fall into place until later in the program."

The presentations on assertiveness training (item 7) and evaluation (item 9) were rated lowest, slightly above "moderately" helpful. Participants' comments suggested that participants' remarks and questions interfered with the effectiveness of the assertiveness presentation; for example:

> "Would have been better if she could have presented her information without so much interruption from the group."

There also was some confusion among participants about the distinction between assertiveness and aggressiveness:

"Many people seemed confused on assertiveness/aggressive issue;" and

"Identify the distinctions between assertiveness and aggression -- facilitating and inhibiting aspects."

The presentation on evaluation appeared to be affected by the amount of time allotted for the material covered:

"Not enough time on this;" and

"This is a weakness for me. Maybe do this by small groups at different times so we could look at materials while having them explained."

The field practitioner reports (items 10, 11, and 12), with one exception were rated "quite" helpful. The comments regarding the presentation on dealing with administrators (item 12) indicated that one person's report was very good, but the other's was less meaningful; thus, the lower overall mean rating.

The psychosocial visits to determine what business and industry programs are in progress to expand women's and men's career options were very highly rated (items 13 and 14). The reactions to these items indicate the experience was very "eye-opening" to an area in which participants had little previous exposure:

"Welcome to the real world. I visited a union shop and realized that unions do not think we are born free."

The general response to this activity is interesting in light of the fact that participants placed a generally lower priority upon it relative to other learning objectives for workshop.

The videotape viewing activities received at least mean ratings of "quite" useful. A significant factor with this group of activities appeared to be, simply, examination of a final product or a preliminary one. The overview tape of Project BORN FREE (item 15), "A World of Options," was well received as indicated by the mean response score of 6.25 (SD=.87). This tape serves as the model for other videotapes to be produced by Project BORN FREE; a number of per-

sons expressed eagerness to use it and the other planned tapes:

> "I am anxious to view the other 9 tapes;" and
>
> "Very well done; am anxious to use this with our staff and parents to get their reactions."

However, the women's and men's support group tapes (item 16) contrasted a final, edited tape (women's support group), completed for another project, with unedited content (men's support group) filmed for Project BORN FREE; typical comments were:

> "Women were great. Men were terrible. Hence the moderate rating;" and
>
> "Women's-excellent, men's-poor. The men's tape needs to be redone."

The content of the men's tape did have value for some. As one male educator commented:

> "The first time I'd seen any men in a 'support group.' I had some emotional identification with male stereotyping."

The several videotape viewing sessions (item 17) also resulted in varying reactions, given the dual purpose of the viewing sessions a) to expose participants to different persons' career and sex-role socialization experiences and b) to have participants assist in locating the best tape segments for final editing. For the most part, however, the mean rating indicated the sessions were 'quite" useful. An apt comment summarizing several participants' feelings was:

> "I didn't expect to like viewing the tapes. I thought it was probably more beneficial to the BORN FREE staff than the participants but I picked up a lot of 'gems' I could identify with."

The module activities also were useful to participants, including a brief review/evaluation of several activities (item 18) and, especially, actual participation in the activities selected for field testing in the workshop (item

19). The only criticism was not of the module activities themselves, but that more time should have been allotted in the workshop schedule to complete them.

Team planning sessions (item 20) and the preparation and group presentation of action plans (item 21) for implementing changes in participants' institutions were considered useful; especially the latter set of activities. Comments indicated that the preparation and presentation assignment required participants to think out the process and make concrete plans:

> "Forced us to use the implementation tools and concerned the change process. Had I not written this I probably would have done nothing."

It also provided feedback among participant teams for comparison of ideas:

> "I was very interested in the plans for the other elementary schools and to realize that our goals were comparable, that they were right on track."

The activity with the highest rating of usefulness was participation in the Developmental Growth Groups, a mean response of 6.48 (SD=.91). The groups began with completion of a module activity, followed by a discussion. In general, the groups provided a supportive, open atmosphere in which persons could explore their own beliefs and attitudes and those of others:

> "The best part of the workshop. Wish there could have been much more time for this sort of thing. Was almost a support group for me."

> "Powerful group as far as impact on me. Very open and direct. It gave me a chance to see why people are the way they are."

The large group discussions (item 22) on various topics also were considered "quite" useful. The participants' comments suggested, however, that some persons dominated the discussions and not enough time was allotted for in depth discussion.

Participants rated the assigned texts (item 24) as helpful (mean=5.20, SD=1.65), although a number of persons stated they did not have enough time to read the entire texts. Most participants indicated they did not take advantage

of or have time to review the other supplementary reading materials made available for them (item 25), hence, the lower mean rating of usefulness.

The journal reflections (item 26), participants' recording of their thoughts and reactions to each day's experiences, also were rated as highly useful. Participants indicated the exercise helped them examine, clarify, and verbalize their feelings and attitudes:

> "Good way to force myself to reflect on what happened during the day. Found out a lot about my feelings and attitudes by doing this every day. Very time consuming, but useful."
>
> "They got easier to write as we progressed. It became easier to be more open, less superficial."

The "catch-up session" (item 27) involved a brief coverage near the end of the workshop of several topics of interest that were not included in the regular schedule. Although several topics were touched upon, the one of greatest interest that contributed to the relatively high mean usefulness rating (mean=5.50, SD=1.41), was the topic of sex-role identity and sexual preference development. Participants considered this a major problem area because of potential arguments that fostering nontraditional interests in boys and girls may also affect their sex-role identity. The response to this discussion was positive among participants, although a number of comments suggested the topic needed to be discussed more fully:

> "This session touched on a topic completely missed I think should have been discussed (Gay Rights and what effect totally freeing roles will have.)"
>
> "For our purposes (participants in the program) I would have liked more attention given to sexuality and how the sexual preference issue does indeed seem to be implicit (for me) in the BORN FREE concept."

To briefly summarize, most workshop activities were considered at least "quite" useful by participants. The most highly rated activities were those that fostered examination of one's own and others' attitudes and beliefs about career and sex-role socialization. The Developmental Growth Groups, journal

reflections and module activities all received mean usefulness ratings of 6.0 or greater. These results are consistent with the highest priority of participants for the workshop: self-awareness and self-change.

The videotape products also appear to have high potential for usefulness. Although only one tape was completed for field testing in the workshop, it received a mean rating of 6.25; the other edited tape previously produced by the Project Director also was well received. Each completed videotape produced by Project BORN FREE will have to be evaluated individually to determine its effectiveness. However, the preliminary examination of tapes during the workshop was favorable.

The psychosocial visits to business and industry concerns also were rated highly with a mean usefulness rating of over 6.00 for both the visits and related discussion. The retreat at the beginning of the workshop resulted in the next highest level of mean ratings. The preparation and presentation of change agent action plans and the "catch up session" with its discussion of sex-role identity development also were among the more consistently highly rated activities. Responses to other activities were more varied, but, in all, participant reactions described above provide a concrete basis for revision of future workshop formats.

Open-ended questions. Participants were asked ten open-ended questions to provide a less structured vehicle for them to indicate the impact of the workshop upon themselves; their satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the workshop; and their recommendations for improving its effectiveness. Responses were reviewed and grouped into general themes expressed by participants. Tables 12-A to 21-A summarize and provide sample responses of the theme statements for each question.

The first set of questions requested participants to describe changes in their attitudes, knowledge, and skills as a result of the workshop. Five gen-

eral statements summarized the majority of participants' responses concerning attitude change (see Table 12-A). Participants commented that the workshop increased both their general awareness of how prevalent sex-role stereotyping practices are in society and their recognition of such practices when they encounter them (item 1). As expected, participants more specifically responded that the workshop increased awareness of their own behaviors and attitudes that reflect sex biases and sex-role stereotyped values (item 2). One major result was that several participants changed their general approach and methods to counter what they perceive as sex biased attitudes and behaviors of other people. A number of persons expressed a willingness to be less confrontive toward biases in other persons and to attempt to effect changes with a more gradual, less threatening style of interaction (item 3). Another important general area of attitude change was an increase in awareness that males are hindered by sex-role stereotypes to a much greater extent than previously believed (item 4). Finally, a number of participants indicated they feel more greatly supported and reinforced for their actions and concerns to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices in society (item 5).

Table 13-A lists the four general statements that summarize participants' changes in knowledge as a result of the workshop. One result, as desired, was an increase in general knowledge of career development concepts and sex-role stereotyping (item 1). These responses also could be expected given the limited knowledge in these areas of a number of participants at the beginning of the workshop. However, as one response example indicates (Table 13-A, statement 1), persons with a previous background in these areas learned new information. The workshop also increased participants' knowledge of resources and literature in the area of career development and sex-role stereotyping (item 2). For a number of participants, the workshop provided factual data to support their personal beliefs (item 3). Participants also indicated an increase in practical knowledge

for functioning as change agents to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping (item 4).

A number of participants reported (Table 14-A) their skills in directing group process activities increased as a result of the workshop (item 1). Other participants indicated they were better able to clarify and articulate their own attitudes and feelings as a result of the workshop in general and, particularly, as a result of the group process activities (item 2). A third area of skills change was an increase in participants' abilities to function as change agents in their institutions (item 3). A fourth major summary category of participant responses was: no change (item 4). A number of persons felt there was little or no change in any specific skills as a result of the workshop.

Another set of questions asked participants what they had gained most, expected but did not gain, and gained unexpectedly from the workshop. Tables 15-A, 16-A, and 17-A, respectively, summarize general themes from participant responses to these questions.

In terms of "the one thing" gained most from the workshop (Table 15-A), participants' responses predominantly stated that personal growth and awareness of their behaviors and attitudes (item 1) was a major outcome. The support of others for and participants' self-confidence in their beliefs and attitudes to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices was another major gain (item 2). Two other significant and related gains were the contacts and sharing of ideas with other persons (item 3) and also a better understanding of the attitudes and beliefs of other persons concerning career-related sex-role stereotyping (item 4). In general, these response themes express a greater understanding of oneself and a mutual sharing, support, and understanding among participants.

Participants' responses of what they had hoped to gain from the workshop but did not (Table 16-A) varied. For a number of persons, they had no expecta-

tions prior to the workshop and were not disappointed in any way (item 4). For others, they would have liked more information on particular topics (item 3) or practical application techniques, especially for working with students directly (item 1). The topic of sex-role identity development, however, was one topic of concern to a number of persons (item 2). Consistent with persons' previous remarks about this topic, more time should have been devoted to discussing it.

In response to a question about one thing participants gained from the workshop that they did not anticipate initially (Table 17-A), participants reiterated a number of previous themes: close associations and relationships with others (item 1); personal growth and self-awareness (item 2); and increased knowledge for functioning as change agents (item 3). A fourth area was more desire to effect changes, an increase in commitment and motivation to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping practices (item 4).

Participants also described "the one thing" they were most satisfied with in the workshop. As Table 18-A indicates, the professional organization, preparation, and conduct of the workshop (item 1) was one major satisfaction. Other recurring themes were the sharing and support among workshop participants (item 2), participation in the Developmental Growth Groups (item 3), and the materials and resources provided to participants (item 4). Major dissatisfactions were more varied (Table 19-A). The lack of time for all scheduled activities was one common response (item 1). Several participants had some criticisms of specific activities, though no one activity stood out as a problem area (item 2). Still others were confused about the priorities and dissatisfied with the orientation of the workshop, that is, the emphasis given to different types of activities (item 3).

To make a future workshop more effective, (Table 20-A), most participant responses referred to the time factor. Responses fell into two groups: those recommending activities remain about the same and the number of workshop days

be increased to accommodate the activities (item 1); and those suggesting the total time period should remain the same and the number of activities be reduced and explored in greater depth, selecting the best activities from this workshop (item 2). Another recommendation was a change in balance among discussion and other types of activities (item 3). The Developmental Growth Groups were considered the most beneficial by participants. Several persons strongly expressed the opinion that greater emphasis be given to these, as well as large group discussions in future programs.

One final query concerned "the one thing" participants felt would be most useful from Project BORN FREE to help them implement changes in their institutions (Table 21-A). One general set of needs included continued communication (item 4) and personal contact (item 2) among workshop participants and Project BORN FREE staff. Another set was assistance from the project in the form of materials (item 1) and personnel, both as resource persons and consultants (item 3). Throughout the workshop, participants were informed these offerings would be available to them during the coming academic year.

Overall value of workshop. As a final summary statement of impact, participants were asked: "How would you rate the overall value of this workshop for you personally?" Responses were coded on a seven-point scale from "very poor" (coded "1") to "excellent" (coded "7"). Responses were provided by 39 participants. Of these, 4 persons (10.3%) rated the workshop as "good;" 14 persons (35.9%) rated it "very good;" and 21 persons (53.8%) rated it "excellent." The mean rating was 6.44 (SD=.68), indicating that participants considered the two-week workshop of great overall value.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Because the 1977 Summer Institute was an initial field test of the workshop

model and the preliminary forms of the Project BORN FREE training materials, this section focuses upon two general questions: a) how adequate were these components in their original design, and b) what modifications would be desirable for similar future workshops?

Workshop effectiveness. The evidence provided above strongly indicates the workshop model was an effective approach for training educators. It provided them with the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to function as change agents to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions. The participants considered the workshop of high overall personal value. The workshop provided and participants learned a substantial amount of information corresponding to the stated workshop objectives and in line with participants' priorities for these objectives.

Participants reported that they significantly increased their knowledge in the general areas of staff development/inservice training and educational development/improvement, and, also, in the areas of career development and sex-role stereotyping. They also considered themselves to be more aware of sex-role stereotyping practices in general, in their jobs, as it affects student career development, as it might be perceived in their behaviors, and as it affects men as well as women. Further, they believed they were better able to examine, understand, and articulate their own and others' attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-role stereotyping.

Participants also indicated they were better equipped with the tools necessary to function as change agents in their institutions. Their initial expectations of the utility of the workshop were borne out. They stated they had a greater knowledge of the resources and literature on career development and sex-role stereotyping, including research information to support their previous beliefs about the existence of sex-role stereotyping problems. At the end of the workshop, they also reported they had a better command of group process and

other skills to facilitate their work as change agents. The support of and relationships with other persons concerned about reducing career-related sex-role stereotyping was an added benefit of the workshop.

Throughout the workshop participants maintained their priorities about which target groups were most important to them for change. They considered altering their own and their students' sex-role stereotyped attitudes and behaviors as most important, although change of their colleagues and their institutions' policies and practices was important also.

This stance may reflect a realistic perspective on expectations for change. First, as a number of persons indicated, to be effective change agents, educators must have a thorough understanding of their own beliefs and behaviors before they can expect to effect meaningful changes in others. They must serve as good role models. Second, as suggested earlier, educators have a higher probability of effecting changes in those areas in which they have greater responsibility, and, thus, greater influence. Their first responsibility is to their students; they also have more direct contact with their students than with other segments of their institutions. Given limited time and resources, change of oneself and one's students would be the most likely place to have the greatest impact initially.

Other participant changes over the course of the workshop suggest that the workshop influenced participants toward a more realistic and, thus, probably more effective approach to implementing change. For example, persons were less likely to disagree that interventions at their educational level would have very limited effects upon altering students' decisions to follow only sex-role stereotyped career options. This change suggests participants had become more aware that their intervention efforts must contend with a student's whole history of socialization toward traditional male-female roles. Participants also became more aware that there is a personal risk involved in attempting changes, whether

in the area of career development or of sex-role stereotyping, in their institutions. This situation obviously is affected by the varying support and acceptance for change evident in particular institutions. However, workshop presentations on problems encountered in various change agent projects may have pointed out some of the resistances and repercussions to change efforts that participants had not considered prior to the workshop.

One final example related to a more realistic perspective of change among participants is their change in tactics. Participants were more willing to accept that the process of change moves slowly; change of sex-role stereotyped attitudes requires altering the effects of a lifetime of socialization of some educators. Several participants changed their approach to be less confrontive, less threatening, and to accept and reinforce small, gradual changes in attitudes and behaviors of others.

The ultimate determination of the workshop's effectiveness could not be assessed in the time frame of the workshop. It will be the successful implementation by participants of change programs in their home institutions. However, short-term assessment of the basic workshop model as planned indicated it had a number of desired effects upon the participants.

Workshop materials. Although the evaluation of specific learning materials and the videotapes is the subject of another project evaluation report, assessment of these products in the context of the workshop model resulted in favorable responses. The group was optimistic at the beginning of the workshop about the utility of the workshop materials in helping participants effect changes in their institutions. This optimism remained at the end of the workshop. The module activities actually used in the workshop were among the most highly rated activities. Participants' brief review of other module activities also elicited a favorable response to the materials.

The completed videotapes, the one produced for Project BORN FREE and the

one produced previously by the Project Director, also were rated by participants as highly useful. The unedited videotapes, in general, received favorable assessment, although the remaining nine tapes slated for production will have to be field tested and evaluated individually as they are completed.

Workshop activities. The workshop included a number of activities that were well received, were considered highly useful, and will provide a foundation for the development of future workshop formats. The retreat, Developmental Growth Groups, journal reflections, implementation plan preparation and presentation, and psychosocial visits were among the most highly rated activities. The inclusion of the psychosocial visits in future workshops, however, may be dependent upon the needs of the specific groups of participants. The visits were a very meaningful educational experience but were not a relatively high priority area for participants. The module activities and videotapes, as described above, also were among the most well-received workshop activities.

Participants' assessments of the different presentations, for the most part, were favorable. However, reactions to specific presentations varied depending upon participants' previous knowledge, the nature of the topic, or the particular speaker.

Overall, the participants considered the workshop to be well planned, organized, and conducted. Thus, it provides both a feasible and desirable framework for similar future workshops.

Recommendations

Although the basic format of the workshop is sound, participants' comments and a number of other factors indicate changes that might be considered for future workshops. Some have been alluded to earlier; additional considerations are presented below.

Participant characteristics. The participants of this workshop were educators working directly in their individual institutions. They appeared to be

eager and motivated to function as change agents, but, as a group, had limited knowledge and leadership experience in the areas in which the workshop provided instruction. Although several persons had extensive experience in the areas of career development and/or sex-role stereotyping, the group did not have as much experience as originally anticipated. The group also consisted mostly of women, instructors, and post-secondary level educators.

The results of the 1977 Summer Institute should be considered in the context of these persons with the backgrounds and characteristics they brought to the workshop. Potential participants who, for example, are heads of state education department units; are more or less experienced and knowledgeable in areas of sex-role stereotyping, career development, and staff training; will be expected to serve as trainers of change agents; are attending by requirement or involuntarily; or have other significant characteristics that may affect their needs and receptivity to a similar workshop; most likely will require a different orientation and content emphasis than the participants of the Summer Institute. This situation requires a preassessment of potential participants, as comprehensive as allowed, in planning future workshops.

Participant incentives. Although Summer Institute participants were interested in the problems of career-related sex-role stereotyping and in learning to function as change agents, it appears personal concern alone was not enough to insure participant attendance at the two-week workshop. A number of persons indicated, to some degree, that they probably would have attended the workshop even if graduate credits (including tuition, fees, and books) had not been granted. However, a greater number reported that they probably would not have attended without the incentive. The time and energy demands upon participants in such a workshop are great. Although personal and professional interest may be a major factor in having persons consider attendance at a similar workshop,

additional incentives, such as credits, fees, and other expenses, appear to be needed to insure that persons will actually attend.

Workshop organization and content. The most frequent complaint of the Summer Institute participants was time limitations. The number of activities scheduled for the two-week period at times left a number of participants frustrated and confused because they could not explore in greater depth topics and activities in which they were interested or needed further explanation. Future workshops will require a reduction in number of activities if the time span of the workshop remains the same or is reduced. As several participants suggested, their responses to the workshop evaluation should be used to select the most effective activities for future workshops. However, such selection will have to be made in the context of the characteristics and needs of future workshop attendees.

As for different types of activities, more discussion time, especially small groups discussion as in the Developmental Growth Groups, appears desirable. Didactic presentations may be put in printed form for participants to read prior to the workshop or class sessions and class sessions reserved for discussion of these materials, module activities, or videotape viewing. Again, depending upon the characteristics of the group, more content might be included on practical strategies for involving parents, community members, and, especially, students, in reducing career-related sex-role stereotyping. Such strategies for involvement appeared to be one area in which Summer Institute participants believed the workshop fell short of its goals.

A discussion of issues of sex-role identity development and sexuality as they relate to the Project BORN FREE concept also should be included in future workshops. Regardless of participant characteristics, these issues represent a potential fear of many persons in the education of students for greater career

options and nontraditional roles. Workshop participants should be provided with knowledge and methods to deal with these concerns, a potential source of great resistance on the part of educators and parents.

Evaluation needs. The evaluation of the 1977 Summer Institute was formative and preliminary because the workshop was a first attempt at implementing this component of the BORN FREE project plan. With greater refinement of the workshop design, based upon this first experience, a number of corresponding revisions of the evaluation plan also should be considered. Where conditions permit, a more extensive preassessment of participants prior to the workshop should be conducted. Also, if possible, the preassessment should be conducted far enough in advance of the workshop to serve as a planning tool for specific workshop content and orientation. At the same time, however, flexibility should be planned into the workshop schedule to modify activities based upon participants' comments and suggestions during the course of the workshop.

The evaluation of the 1977 Summer Institute relied upon general and single item questions to assess participants' knowledge, attitudes, and experiences both before and after the workshop. With refinement of the workshop design, additional or alternative measures could be employed. A standardized sex-role attitude survey may be beneficial for normative comparisons with other groups, if a suitable instrument is located and is appropriate for the participant group; and if time schedules permit its administration. A test of factual knowledge, also for use at pre- and post-workshop assessments, might be employed to relate specific knowledge gains directly to the content of the workshop.

All these evaluation considerations suggest that a more extensive battery of evaluation instruments be developed and sent to participants a number of weeks before the workshop. This procedure will maximize the use of the available information; help to plan the workshop tailored to the needs and characteristics of participants; and increase the likelihood of continued effectiveness

of the workshop model implemented in the Summer Institute.

In sum, the Summer Institute was a highly successful workshop for staff development training to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. Participants considered it well-organized with substantive content. Participants experienced gains in their knowledge and awareness of sex-role stereotyping and its impact upon the career development of individuals. They also developed a variety of skills necessary to function effectively as change agents in their institutions. Some minor changes in the workshop structure and content, as mentioned above, might be considered for future workshops, depending upon the appropriateness of such changes for the group of participants. As implemented, the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute represents a sound workshop model for staff training to broaden the range of career options of both women and men.

REFERENCES

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. I: A model of educational change (R-1589/1-HEW). Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation, September, 1974.

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. IV: The findings in review (R-1589/4-HEW). Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation, April, 1975.

Havelock, R.G. The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology, 1973.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1-A

Frequency of Participation In and Leadership Of
Educational Programs by Workshop Participants

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
Participation		
How often have you:		
1. participated in Project BORN FREE-related activities in your institution this past year?	2.23	1.51
2. participated previously in staff development/inservice programs?	4.18	1.48
3. participated previously in programs for educational improvement?	4.50	1.30
4. participated previously in programs on career development?	2.60	1.45
5. participated previously in programs on sex-role stereotyping?	2.38	1.25
Leadership		
How often have you:		
6. coordinated staff development/inservice training programs?	2.38	1.52
7. coordinated programs for educational improvement?	2.28	1.50
8. coordinated programs on career development?	2.23	1.72
9. coordinated programs on sex-role stereotyping?	1.48	.82

[a] Number of respondents=40; Responses were coded as follows: 1="not at all;" 2="once in a while;" 3="sometimes;" 4="fairly often;" 5="quite often;" 6="very often."

TABLE 2-A

Knowledge and Leadership Experience
of Workshop Participants for Educational Programs

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
Knowledge		
To what extent would you say you are:		
1. knowledgeable about the topic of staff development/inservice training?	3.65	1.48
2. knowledgeable about the topic of educational improvement?	4.13	1.29
3. knowledgeable about the topic of career development?	3.45	1.20
4. knowledgeable about the topic of sex-role stereotyping?	3.98	1.27
Leadership Experience		
To what extent would you say you are:		
5. experienced in coordinating staff development/inservice training programs?	2.75	1.84
6. experienced in coordinating programs for educational improvement?	2.75	1.52
7. experienced in coordinating programs on career development?	2.45	1.45
8. experienced in coordinating programs on sex-role stereotyping?	2.00	1.45

[a] Number of respondents=40; Responses were coded as follows: 1="not at all;" 2="slightly;" 3="somewhat;" 4="moderately;" 5="quite;" 6="very;" 7="extremely."

TABLE 3-A

Knowledge and Skills Acquired by Workshop Participants: Importance of Application to Different Target Groups

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. I can apply what I learn to help change my own attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	40	6.03	1.10
2. I can apply what I learn to help change my students' attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting their and other students' career options.	39	5.97	1.06
3. I can apply what I learn to help change my institution's policies and programs that may be limiting the career options of students.	40	5.20	1.51
4. I can apply what I learn to help change my colleagues' attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	39	5.41	1.31
5. I can apply what I learn to help change parents' attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	40	4.45	1.91

[a] Responses coded as follows: 1="not at all important;" 2="slightly important;" 3="somewhat important;" 4="moderately important;" 5="quite important;" 6="very important;" 7="extremely important."

TABLE 4-A

Workshop Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex-stereotyped roles for male students.	4.69	1.47
2. There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex-stereotyped roles for female students.	5.03	1.35
3. There are many practices in my institution that encourage broadened career options for male students.	4.28	1.78
4. There are many practices in my institution that encourage broadened career options for female students.	3.72	1.49
5. Practices that limit career options of male students are fairly evident in my institution.	3.92	1.31
6. Practices that limit career options of female students are fairly evident in my institution.	4.69	1.30
7. There is a real need in my institution for programs to counter any practices that limit the career options of male students.	5.00	1.08
8. There is a real need in my institution for programs to counter any practices that limit the career options of female students.	5.90	1.07
9. I am sure the knowledge gained from this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that may limit the career options of students.	5.74	.91
10. I am sure the learning materials used in this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that may limit the career options of students.	5.74	1.07
11. I am sure the practical skills gained from this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that limit the career options of students.	5.46	1.05
12. I feel I am able to recognize sex bias and stereotyping when I encounter it in my job.	5.69	.98

TABLE 4-A (continued)

Workshop Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
13.	I feel I am aware of how sex-role stereotyped practices affect the career decisions students make.	5.39	1.04
14.	I feel I am aware of the times when my behaviors might be perceived as reflecting a sex bias.	4.95	1.32
15.	I feel men are less concerned about sex-role stereotyping in making career decisions than women are.	5.08	1.40
16.	I feel sex-role stereotyping is less of a problem for men than for women in making career decisions.	3.56	1.70
17.	In the past, my institution actively has sponsored programs concerned with the problems of sex bias.	4.18	1.93
18.	In the past, my institution actively has sponsored programs concerned with student career development.	5.15	1.57
19.	In my institution, consideration of student career concerns has been an integral part of curricular offerings.	4.21	1.69
20.	My institution is very open to new programs that will benefit students.	4.67	1.71
21.	My institution's administrators support efforts to reduce any sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit student career options.	4.80	1.77
22.	Most of the staff in my institution support efforts to reduce any sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit student career options.	4.13	1.54
23.	My institution's administrators have a longe-range concern for reducing sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit student career options.	4.00	1.73
24.	Most of my institution's staff have a long-range concern for reducing sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit student career options.	3.62	1.65

TABLE 4-A (continued)

Workshop Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item		$\bar{X}$	SD
25.	The students in my institution are fairly aware of sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit their career options.	3.18	1.50
26.	The students in my institution are very concerned about any sex-role stereotyped practices that may limit their career options.	2.90	1.23
27.	In the next year, a number of changes could be made in my institution to reduce sex-role stereotyped practices that limit student career options.	5.44	1.58
28.	There would be some personal risk involved for me in attempting to make changes in my institution in the area of sex-role stereotyping.	4.54	1.65
29.	There would be some personal risk involved for me in attempting to make changes in my institution in the area of career development.	4.31	1.84
30.	To reduce sex-role stereotyped practices in my institution would require some disruptive changes in the system as it is now.	4.36	1.48
31.	To expand practices in my institution for student career development would require some disruptive changes in the system as it is now.	4.41	1.62
32.	Interventions in my institution probably would have very limited effects in countering any parental influences that may have channeled students toward sex-role stereotyped careers.	4.15	1.50
33.	Interventions at my educational level probably would have very limited effects in changing students' decisions to follow only sex-role stereotyped career options.	2.97	1.35
34.	It would require quite an effort to make changes in my institution to reduce any sex-role stereotyped practices that may exist.	4.97	1.66
35.	It would require quite an effort to make changes in my institution to expand practices for student career development.	4.72	1.59
36.	The current time demands upon the staff in my institution would limit quite a bit the implementation of any activities to reduce the career-related sex-role stereotyping practices that may exist.	4.80	1.58

TABLE 4-A (continued)

Workshop Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
37. The current economic situation in my institution would limit quite a bit the implementation of any activities to reduce the career-related sex-role stereotyping practices that may exist.	4.26	1.65
38. If college credits had not been granted for this workshop, I probably would not have attended.	3.92	2.11

[a] Number of respondents=39 because one participant could not evaluate the new institution to which he was transferred for the 1977-78 academic year; responses were coded as follows: 1="strongly disagree;" 2="disagree;" 3="slightly disagree;" 4="neither agree nor disagree;" 5="slightly agree;" 6="agree;" 7="strongly agree."

TABLE 5-A

Content Provision of Workshop for
Attainment of Objectives

Descriptive Statistics[a]

Objective	$\bar{X}$	SD
Participants will:		
1. Increase their awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-roles and of the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options.	5.85	1.08
2. Become familiar with a content/process model of in-service training which they can adapt in developing their own implementation plans.	5.43	1.13
3. Increase their knowledge of programs and change process through which they can reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions.	5.60	1.08
4. Expand their concept of career development education to include education, occupation, and lifestyle options in a developmental framework.	5.48	1.11
5. Develop ways to increase the involvement of parents, students, and community to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions.	5.05	1.34
6. Become familiar with efforts of business and industry to develop personnel strategies for opening career options for women and men.	4.45	1.30

[a] Number of respondents=40; responses to the question of how much provision was made in the workshop to attain these objectives were coded as follows: 1="none;" 2="a little;" 3="a moderate amount;" 4="fairly much;" 5="much;" 6="very much;" 7="a great amount."

TABLE 6-A

Learning Outcomes of Participants
for Workshop Objectives[a]

Objective	$\bar{X}$	SD
Participants will:		
1. Increase their awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-roles and of the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options.	5.43	1.36
2. Become familiar with a content/process model of in-service training which they can adapt in developing their own implementation plans.	5.35	1.03
3. Increase their knowledge of programs and change process through which they can reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions.	5.58	.96
4. Expand their concept of career development education to include education, occupation, and lifestyle options in a developmental framework.	5.23	1.27
5. Develop ways to increase the involvement of parents, students, and community to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions.	4.85	1.25
6. Become familiar with efforts of business and industry to develop personnel strategies for opening career options for women and men.	4.50	1.45

[a] Number of respondents=40; responses to the question of how much did the workshop participants learn with regard to each of the objectives were coded as follows: 1="nothing;" 2="a little;" 3="a moderate amount;" 4="fairly much;" 5="much;" 6="very much;" 7="a great amount."

TABLE 7-A

Importance of Workshop Objectives to Participants[a]

Objective	$\bar{X}$	SD
Participants will:		
1. Increase their awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-roles and of the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options.	6.63	.54
2. Become familiar with a content/process model of in-service training which they can adapt in developing their own implementation plans.	5.60	1.30
3. Increase their knowledge of programs and change process through which they can reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions.	5.90	1.06
4. Expand their concept of career development education to include education, occupations, and lifestyle options in a developmental framework.	5.70	1.14
5. Develop ways to increase the involvement of parents, students, and community to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions.	5.73	1.13
6. Become familiar with efforts of business and industry to develop personnel strategies for opening career options for women and men.	5.40	1.24

[a] Number of respondents=40; responses to the question of how important each objective is to workshop participants were coded as follows: 1="not at all;" 2="slightly;" 3="somewhat;" 4="moderately;" 5="quite;" 6="very;" 7="extremely."

TABLE 8-A

Comparison of Participants' Estimates of
Knowledge at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments [a]

Item	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
To what extent would you say you are:						
1. knowledgeable about the topic of staff development/inservice training?	3.69	1.47	4.79	1.28	-5.16	.001
2. knowledgeable about the topic of educational improvement?	4.21	1.20	4.82	1.17	-2.57	.01
3. knowledgeable about the topic of career development?	3.51	1.14	4.87	1.03	-6.81	.001
4. knowledgeable about the topic of sex-role stereotyping?	4.00	1.28	5.87	.73	-8.25	.001

[a] Number of respondents=39 because one participant did not respond to these questions at post-assessment; responses were coded as follows: 1="not at all;" 2="slightly;" 3="somewhat;" 4="moderately;" 5="quite;" 6="very;" 7="extremely."

TABLE 9-A

Participants' Knowledge and Skills Acquired from Workshop:
Comparison of Importance of Application to
Different Target Groups at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments[a]

Item	N[b]	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
1. I can apply what I have learned to help change my own attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	39	6.00	1.10	6.23	.99	-.91	.37
2. I can apply what I have learned to help change my students' attitudes, values, and bahaviors that may be limiting their and other students' career options.	37	6.08	.98	5.89	1.08	1.16	.26
3. I can apply what I have learned to help change my institution's policies and programs that may be limiting the career options of students.	39	5.28	1.43	5.44	1.10	-.62	.54
4. I can apply what I have learned to help change my colleagues' attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	38	5.47	1.27	5.37	1.17	.47	.64
5. I can apply what I have learned to help change parents' attitudes, values, and behaviors that may be limiting the career options of students.	38	4.55	1.87	4.11	1.81	1.49	.15

[a] Responses were coded as follows: 1="not at all important;" 2="slightly important;" 3="somewhat important;" 4="moderately important;" 5="quite important;" 6="very important;" 7="extremely important."

[b] Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants at either pre- or post- assessment.

TABLE 10-A

Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments[a]

Item	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
1. There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex-stereotyped roles for male students.	4.69	1.47	5.31	1.34	-3.60	.001
2. There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex-stereotyped roles for female students.	5.03	1.35	5.13	1.58	-.48	.63
3. There are many practices in my institution that encourage broadened career options for male students.	4.28	1.78	4.38	1.73	-.33	.74
4. There are many practices in my institution that encourage broadened career options for female students.	3.72	1.49	3.69	1.51	.12	.90
5. Practices that limit career options of male students are fairly evident in my institution.	3.92	1.31	4.36	1.63	-1.79	.08
6. Practices that limit career options of female students are fairly evident in my institution.	4.69	1.30	4.95	1.75	-1.02	.31
7. There is a real need in my institution for programs to counter any practices that limit the career options of male students.	5.00	1.08	5.10	1.31	-.43	.67
8. There is a real need in my institution for programs to counter any practices that limit the career options of female students.	5.90	1.07	5.97	1.04	-.55	.58
9. I am sure the knowledge gained from this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that may limit the career options of students.	5.74	.91	6.00	.92	-1.66	.11
10. I am sure the learning materials used in this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that may limit the career options of students.	5.74	1.07	5.79	1.08	-.26	.80

TABLE 10-A (continued)

Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments[a]

Item	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
11. I am sure the practical skills gained from this workshop will help me counter any practices in my institution that limit the career options of students.	5.46	1.05	5.87	1.06	-2.05	.05
12. I feel I am able to recognize sex bias and stereotyping when I encounter it in my job.	5.69	.98	6.05	.61	-2.41	.02
13. I feel I am aware of how sex-role stereotyped practices affect the career decisions students make.	5.38	1.04	5.95	.67	-3.22	.003
14. I feel I am aware of the times when my behaviors might be perceived as reflecting a sex bias.	4.95	1.32	5.56	1.05	-3.19	.003
15. I feel sex-role stereotyping is less of a problem for men than for women in making career decisions.	3.56	1.70	3.72	2.05	-.54	.59
16. I feel men are less concerned about sex-role stereotyping in making career decisions than women are.	5.11	1.41	4.82	1.92	.79	.44
17. In the next year, a number of changes could be made in my institution to reduce sex-role stereotyped practices that limit student career options.	5.44	.97	5.44	.97	.00	1.00
18. Interventions in my institution probably would have very limited effects in countering any parental influences that may have channeled students toward sex-role stereotyped careers.	4.15	1.50	4.23	1.63	-.35	.73
19. Interventions at my educational level probably would have very limited effects in changing students' decisions to follow only sex-role stereotyped career options.	2.97	1.35	3.85	1.44	-3.53	.001

TABLE 10-A (continued)

Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments[a]

Item	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
20. There would be some personal risk involved for me in attempting to make changes in my institution in the area of sex-role stereotyping.	4.54	1.65	5.23	1.71	-3.18	.003
21. There would be some personal risk involved for me in attempting to make changes in my institution in the area of career development.	4.31	1.84	4.76	1.71	-1.86	.07
22. To reduce sex-role stereotyped practices in my institution would require some disruptive changes in the system as it is now.	4.36	1.48	4.72	1.67	-1.25	.22
23. To expand practices in my institution for student career development would require some disruptive changes in the system as it is now.	4.41	1.62	4.62	1.60	-1.02	.32
24. It would require quite an effort to make changes in my institution to reduce any sex-role stereotyped practices that may exist.	4.97	1.66	5.38	1.43	-1.55	.13
25. It would require quite an effort to make changes in my institution to expand practices for student career development.	4.72	1.59	5.03	1.25	-1.61	.12
26. The current time demands upon the staff in my institution would limit quite a bit the implementation of any activities to reduce the career-related sex-role stereotyping practices that may exist.	4.79	1.58	5.18	1.43	-1.40	.17
27. The current economic situation in my institution would limit quite a bit the implementation of any activities to reduce the career-related sex-role stereotyping practices that may exist.	4.26	1.65	3.95	1.70	1.10	.28

[a] Number of respondents=39 (see footnote a, Table 4-A), except N=38 for item 16; responses were coded as follows: 1="strongly disagree;" 2="disagree;" 3="slightly disagree;" 4="neither agree nor disagree;" 5="slightly agree;"

TABLE 11-A

Usefulness of Workshop Activities[a] and Presentations for Participants

Item	N[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD
Retreat			
1. Saturday's retreat at the Christian Brothers Retreat Center, in general	40	5.80	1.38
2. Saturday's retreat - group process activities	40	5.48	1.50
3. Saturday's retreat - free time	40	5.73	1.47
Didactic Presentations			
4. Career Development Conceptual Framework	39	5.39	1.29
5. Literature reviews	40	4.93	1.61
6. Group process guidelines for workshop leaders	40	4.85	1.44
7. Assertiveness Training and Sex-Role Stereotyping	40	4.25	1.61
8. Conceptual Model for Change; Resistance to Change	39	5.15	1.39
9. Evaluating activities	40	4.15	1.55
Field Practitioner Reports			
10. Illustrative programs	40	5.05	1.43
11. Becoming Change Agents - practitioner discussion	39	5.39	1.39
12. How to deal with administrators	39	3.97	1.80
Visit to Business/Industry			
13. Psychosocial visits	39	6.03	1.37
14. Sharing psychosocial visits	40	6.23	.92
Videotape Viewing			
15. Videotape - "A World of Options" and discussion following	40	6.25	.87
16. Videotapes - Women's and men's support groups and discussion following	38	5.03	1.46
17. Videotape viewing sessions	40	5.00	1.28
Module Materials: use and review			
18. Review of module learning strategies	39	5.36	1.37
19. Module activities	40	6.00	1.07

TABLE 11-A (continued)

Usefulness of Workshop Activities and Presentations for Participants[a]

Item	N[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD
Team Planning			
20. Team planning sessions	38	5.03	1.73
21. Preparation and presentation of implementation plan	40	5.75	1.13
Group Discussion			
22. Large group discussions in class	40	5.13	1.29
23. Developmental Growth Groups	40	6.48	.91
Reading Materials			
24. Reading assigned texts	40	5.20	1.65
25. Materials browsing/reading	39	3.69	1.58
Other Activities			
26. Journal reflections	40	6.05	1.04
27. "Catch Up Session"	40	5.50	1.41

[a] Responses to the question of how useful each of the workshop presentations or activities was to workshop participants were coded as follows: 1="not at all;" 2="slightly;" 3="somewhat;" 4="moderately;" 5="quite;" 6="very;" 7="extremely."

[b] Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

TABLE 12-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my attitudes have changed as a result of this workshop in the following way:"[a]

---

1. An increase in general awareness of the prevalence of sex-role stereotyping and its effects upon the career development of males and females.

   Response Examples:

   "I think I have a keener awareness of sex-role and role stereotyping, and am more willing to talk about this subject."

   "My awareness level has heightened tremendously. I am more aware of sexist remarks, stereotyping, etc."

   "More awareness of how constant, though subliminal, stereotyping 'brainwashes' one's decisions."

   "I am much more sensitive in all verbal communication to sex attitudes stereotyping. I have moved to the 'feminist' pole."

2. An increase in awareness of one's own attitudes and behaviors as they reflect sex-role stereotypes.

   Response Examples:

   "I feel I am more aware of my feelings and attitudes regarding sex-roles. I've been forced to think about and evaluate my own position and behaviors. Before I can implement, I need to come to grips with ME first."

   "I am amazed at the additional awareness that I have gained during this brief but concentrated 2 week period. I had considered myself to be 'liberated' but I feel a great deal of growth after sharing the 'BORN FREE' experience. (It helps me realize that there is an unlimited amount of room for personal growth in this area.)"

   "I don't feel my attitudes have changed much. I do feel I have become more aware of my stereotyping behavior and on forces contributing to those behaviors."

   "I have become more aware of my own sexism and more committed to changing it and the sexist stereotypes with regards to careers that exist at my school."

3. A change in personal approaches to counter sex-role stereotyped attitudes and behaviors of other persons.

   Response Examples:

   "My approach to people and techniques for implementing the objectives of the project have done an about-face. I was already committed to BORN FREE's goals but was not having much success with implementation because of my 'shove it down your throat' attitude of sharing ideas."

   "I feel I am more willing to accept small changes and verbally reinforce others. I also key into stereotypic statements that I haven't picked up on before. Don't be threatening."

TABLE 12-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my attitudes have changed as a result of this workshop in the following way:"[a]

3. A change in personal approaches to counter sex-role stereotyped attitudes and behaviors of other persons. (continued)

Response Examples:

"I can no longer 'call' to everyone's attention when I feel a sexist comment is made. It diverts too much of my energy to try to 'catch' people being sexist. I have relaxed somewhat."

"I am more willing to make an effort to accept those with different viewpoints, even though they are opposite of mine, and also in my opinion, incorrect."

4. An increase in awareness of the impact of sex-role stereotyping upon males.

Response Examples:

"I am aware of the need for men's roles not to be limited as well as women's--I am therefore more sympathetic to men's assumption of a variety of careers and life styles I'd thought 'unfortunate'."

"I am more concerned with equality of both sexes. I was limiting myself to women's rights more than I realized."

"I have a healthier attitude of men--I understand more of how they are a product of socialization."

"I found that men are more open to exploring their own attitudes on this--are more approachable than I've found before."

"I am more sensitive to the male side of sex-role stereotyping."

5. An increase in support for one's concerns and beliefs about sex-role stereotyping.

Response Examples:

"I came to the workshop at a high level of awareness. It became rather acute during the last week. I have been reinforced and feel good about many things I have done, am doing, and where I feel I am going."

"I'm thinking about the issues again; revitalization of attitudes; realization that resistances are not the only thing around me; there are good people, good ideas, positive motivations."

"I feel freer to express my feminist feelings."

"I have been reinforced with facts and data where I was before the workshop!"

[a] Number of respondents=39

TABLE 13-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my knowledge has changed as a result of this w rkshop in the following way:"[a]

---

1. An increase in general knowledge of the concepts of career development and sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples: "As a result of the workshop and its awareness-giving quality my knowledge of what sex-role stereotyping really is has improved."

   "I've acquired a more basic understanding of career development concepts."

   "I have gained a refresher (and in some ways, new information) about career development itself. I have more knowledge of perspectives and resources re: the field of women's and men's rights and perspectives on men's and women's consciousness-raising."

2. An increase in knowledge of general resources available on the topics of career development and sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples: "Realize now there is a lot of research and printed materials available. Also know that there are a lot of resource people available."

   "Whole awareness of issues--my head is blown with all the literature out there I want to read in the next year."

   "I have learned many new and exciting things--plus I know where to get materials to continue on."

   "Aware of research, books, resources in this area."

3. An increase in information to support one's existing beliefs about sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples: "I feel I now know that the literature holds information to back up what I have felt inside. There are tests to show why things have occurred and I have a better understanding of what has happened these past several years. It's good to know 'why'."

   "Exposure to more documented research in the subject. I have something to back up my feelings and opinions."

   "I have accumulated a tremendous amount of information and experiential materials to use in order to implement goals and objectives. I was operating primarily from personal motivation, opinion, and a few magazine articles before this workshop."

   "My suspicions have been supported."

TABLE 13-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my knowledge has changed as a result of this workshop in the following way:"[a]

4. An increase in knowledge of methods and resources to implement changes to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping.	
Response Examples:	"Know more about sex-stereotyping (results of studies); know how to change attitudes thru use of activities, acting as a model; I've been pleasantly overwhelmed by all of the things presented."
	"Exposure to a vast resource of materials has been valuable. Proven techniques are extremely valuable in implementation. The packets should be invaluable!"
	"Gaining knowledge of strategies has been great--having these to work with students, advisory committees, etc., will provide a basis of getting my point across."
	"I have learned of new resources that will help me work at (eliminating)--reducing sex-role stereotyping in my home institution."

[a] Number of respondents=40

TABLE 14-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my skills have changed as a result of this workshop in the following ways:"[a]

---

1. An increase in skills for facilitating group process and interaction.

   Response Examples:

   "I would feel much more comfortable in facilitating beginning groups in this area. I feel also I could be a resource person of sorts. I guess I could identify with the problems others will have in regard to this issue, particularly in the early stages."

   "I have an increased ability to deal with groups of individuals I do not know very well at first. I can take some emphasis off personal relationships and put it on the topic at hand."

   "I'm doing more paraphrasing to find out how others are feeling; perhaps have become more aware of using techniques to let others explore their own behaviors."

   "I feel I have developed some skill as a group member; alternative ways to get at a concept in communication within a group."

   "Becoming a better group participant and facilitator."

2. An increase in ability to examine and communicate one's feelings and views.

   Response Examples:

   "I communicate my feelings on the topic more clearly. (My feelings are more clearly defined in my mind.)"

   "I have increased my skill in facing myself and my feelings. Each module we used represented a certain kind of skill which was practiced in the exercise."

   "The group sessions (growth development) were an excellent review of group process and how to externalize and own one's thoughts and opinions."

   "The ability to be more open with people in dealing with this subject."

3. An increase in ability to function as a change agent in an educational institution.

   Response Examples:

   "I'm learning more explicitly about how to be an effective change agent; writing the (implementation) plan sharpened skills on setting objectives and on evaluation and on building a plan that fits together."

   "I feel more capable of running an inservice in this area. My skills at conversing with men and women on issues important to me have improved."

   "I am more aware of how to implement change--and that helps me professionally and personally."

   "I am now more prepared to act as a facilitator in my home school."

TABLE 14-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"I feel my skills have changed as a result of this workshop in the following ways:"[a]

---

4. No increase in skills.

   Response Examples: "I can't identify any skill changes."
   "Not really."
   "Very little."
   "Not particularly."

---

[a] Number of respondents=39

TABLE 15-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"The one thing I gained most from this workshop was:"[a]

---

1. Personal growth and increased awareness in the area of career-related sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples:

   "Personal growth and awareness which is step #1 in making others aware."

   "Changes (positive) in my own attitudes and awareness. It's as if someone kicked me square in the butt! I thought I was fairly into it prior to the workshop, but that wasn't too accurate."

   "A deeper awareness of my own sex bias and stereotyping."

   "Focusing on my awareness and assessing my attitudes. Also becoming more aware of others especially those who are in relation to me."

2. Support for and self-confidence in one's beliefs and activities to counter career-related sex-role stereotyping practices.

   Response Examples.

   "Self-confidence in dealing with vital issues in 'unknown' territory. Now I feel I have a support group--out there somewhere!"

   "Strength to go forward. A great feeling that I have proceeded correctly as I stumbled along. A greater understanding of some of my colleagues."

   "Greater awareness of where my head is at and increased support for many of my attitudes and beliefs."

   "The belief that I am part of an 'idea whose time has come' (too late for some) but I am encouraged to be part of this awakening."

3. Meeting and sharing ideas with other persons.

   Response Examples:

   "Have met some super people--especially from a neighboring institution that holds promise for continuing cooperation (between our institutions)."

   "The knowledge gained from real contact with a wide variety of persons with widely varied backgrounds and stages of development."

   "Meeting with people with concerns like mine in this area."

   "The fun of being with and hearing from a more diverse group of educators than I've been with before."

TABLE 15-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"The one thing I gained most from this workshop was:"[a]

4. <u>An increase in awareness of the attitudes and beliefs of other persons concerning career-related sex-role stereotyping.</u>	
Response Examples:	"Learning about other individuals' attitudes relating to sexuality and sex-role stereotyping. This information I learned informally and especially from developmental growth group discussions."
	"A feeling for the deep commitment some people have to ending sex-role stereotyping in careers."
	"An understanding of where other people are at on this subject of sex-role stereotypes and career decisions."
	"Better understanding of others' attitudes."

[a] Number of respondents=39

TABLE 16-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"One thing I had hoped to gain from this workshop but did not was:"[a]

---

1. More training, information and resources for practical application techniques.

   Response Examples:
   - "More skills in how to plan and facilitate a workshop (now that I look back)."
   - "More practical strategies to use with kids--but the modules are good."
   - "More activities specifically for use with students."
   - "More direct classroom aids of a very practical nature and strategies in working with kids at elementary level--what works and doesn't."

2. Further discussion of sexuality and sex-role identity development.

   Response Examples:
   - "Possibly more discussion like the one talking about Gay Rights and effects of being free of sex-roles on personal values."
   - "The opportunity to discuss the issue of male-female sexuality and how this critical issue fits into the overall scheme of BORN FREE. This in a small group format."
   - "Information in area of child development-sexual role identification and consequent behaviors and attitudes."
   - "An opportunity to share strategies, theories, etc. in dealing with sex-role identity, sexuality issues of students."

3. More information and discussion on specific topic areas.

   Response Examples:
   - "More information on career development."
   - "More information on sex-role stereotyping--I did not have enough time to read."
   - "More ability to have meaningful one-to-one conversations about career options. I feel I am 'stunted' here; the whole range: children, youth, mid-career people, older people, professionals, etc."

4. No previous expectations/Workshop satisfied expectations.

   Response Examples:
   - "I had no preconceived notion of what I would get at this workshop."
   - "My expectations were met and often exceeded."
   - "I had no expectation of the workshop."
   - "I got more than I dared hope for. There was a general attitude of warmth and acceptance I have never felt in a large group before."

---

[a] Number of respondents=33

TABLE 17-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"One thing I gained from this workshop but did not anticipate initially was:"[a]

---

1. Close associations and relationships with other participants.

   Response Examples:
   - "Wonderful friendships and resulting relationships; a mutual sharing of experiences."
   - "Better communication and getting to know the other faculty member also attending which will be helpful in our support group back at school."
   - "The beautiful friendships; one really special person that opened up to me--listened--supported--helped immeasurably and I know this help and support will constantly be there--I am grateful."
   - "To know the people who participated in some depth in a short time."

2. An increase in personal growth and self awareness of attitudes toward sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples:
   - "A deeper awareness of the effects of my background and being forced to look at and analyze who I am."
   - "My awareness and perhaps enthusiastic future hopes concerning a society without sex-role stereotyping. I thought I was already aware--but think I've grown."
   - "That I would be as eager to change and give these ideas a chance to make me a better person and free-up others significant to me."
   - "That I had a pretty 'healthy' basis on which to grow, and I didn't have to break ground for all new ideas. This helped me sharpen and focus many values and ideas which were already OK."

3. An increase in knowledge about effecting change to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples:
   - "Looking at group process; looking at power structure; how to bring about change."
   - "Many 'technical' suggestions about dealing with forces in groups."

4. An increase in commitment and motivation to effect changes in the area of career-related sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples:
   - "A long term involvement in the implementation of BORN FREE's goals and objectives; a personal commitment to the BORN FREE project."

TABLE 17-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"One thing I gained from this workshop but did not anticipate initially was:"[a]

4.	<u>An increase in commitment and motivation to effect changes in the area of career-related sex-role stereotyping</u>. (continued)
Response Examples:	"My strong feelings of commitment to the BORN FREE concept."
	"A big shot in the arm! When I left school this spring I was really discouraged with a lot of staff attitudes and what it was doing to the children. Now I have new impetus to go back and change (alter) some of these attitudes."

[a] Number of respondents=36

TABLE 18-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"The one thing I was most satisfied with in this workshop was:"[a]

---

1. The workshop organization and staff conduct.

   Response Examples:
   - "The organization and amount of work and kinds of energies that went into the workshop before we arrived."
   - "The extreme amount of preparation by staff and facilitators prior to the start of the workshop; the openness of facilitators to the needs and questions of participants; the flexibility of staff in scheduling."
   - "The openness in the staff and participants; also, your allowance for flexibility!"
   - "The professional way it was planned and presented; a tremendous amount of work went into the project."

2. The mutual sharing with and support of other workshop participants.

   Response Examples:
   - "The program and the participants-really open and supportive of one another."
   - "The real sense of community among the participants and the obvious competency of the staff."
   - "The good interaction between the people--the learning that took place."
   - "The personal growth and awareness and the community spirit and cooperation that was evident."

3. Participation in the developmental growth groups.

   Response Examples:
   - "The small group experience was the most satisfying/valuable."
   - "The DGG (developmental growth group)--it must have been a fluke, but it turned out as a daily highlight."
   - "The growth groups and talking with individuals about our own socialization."
   - "The structure provided for small group discussion and facilitators."

4. The learning materials and resources made available to participants.

   Response Examples:
   - "Terrific supply of practical, useable material."
   - "The wealth of materials I can use in my profession."
   - "Becoming familiar with materials through actually experiencing them."

---

[a] Number of respondents=38

TABLE 19-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"The one thing I was least satisfied with ir this workshop was:"[a]

---

1. <u>The amount of time available for scheduled activities</u>.

   Response Examples:

   "Rush--lack of time; really couldn't be helped if we were going to cover all the material."

   "Lack of time to process and a rushed feeling a great deal of the time."

   "Things moved too quickly. I'd have preferred fewer activities with greater depth through more discussion time."

   "The crowding of activities and running out of time to thoroughly complete them."

   "Not enough time to comprehend everything that was coming at me."

2. <u>Specific activities of the workshop</u>.

   Response Examples:

   "All that role playing and the module activities."

   "Assertiveness training--had it previously; some lecture presentations."

   "Change agent models and force analysis (exercise)."

   "The frustrations of the first several days regarding 'implementation plan'."

3. <u>The orientation and priorities of the workshop organization</u>.

   Response Examples:

   "Too much cognitive focus; much of the information could have been dittoed; limited small group activities."

   "I wasn't sure what the priorities were--tape viewing, implementation plans, etc."

   "The hurry up and move on approach; also the p.m. tape viewing and team planning sessions were confusing."

---

[a] Number of respondents=40

TABLE 20-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"To make a similar workshop more effective next time, I would recommend:"[a]

---

1. Increase the amount of time available for workshop activities.

   Response Examples:

   "Longer!--need more time for processing--more time to share with one another, more small group activities--better room--more flexible."

   "A longer period--three weeks. We are now just getting our 'stride' and we will have to break up. There seemed to be a bit of a push which made some exercises a bit jejune (lacking substance)."

   "Keep the field day Saturday; add another week; cut the workshop by one hour a day to implement homework assignment; make longer blocks of time for activities, i.e. two full hours of tape viewing less often than one hour more often."

   "Possibly a shorter day to leave more time for reflecting reading browsing; possibly 3 weeks rather than 2 weeks so it doesn't get so frenetic; when bombarded with so much material and food for thought, it is extremely frustrating to be 'left hanging' and unable to process it to a greater extent."

2. Reduce the number of workshop activities scheduled.

   Response Examoles:

   "Use the results of this evaluation procedure to set priorities; perhaps do fewer things well; great start."

   "Less content--more time to process--and less pressure focused on building a plan--or if 'plan' is assigned--more time and structure."

   "I think we would profit more from some activities after we've gotten more in touch with our feelings. Some things were repetitive. Perhaps unnecessarily. Things moved too quickly. I'd have preferred fewer activities with greater depth through more discussion time."

3. Increase the amount of group discussion time.

   Response Examples:

   "Small group discussions mid-morning and mid-afternoon to allow time for reactions and responses to material presented; would help to reinforce learning."

   "I would like to suggest more small group activities and discussions. I felt that in the small groups by grade level or otherwise (implementation groups, developmental, etc.) much more was accomplished."

   "More time for small groups and to discuss 'things' in the big group. I guess I would be willing to have shorter breaks and lunch time to facilitate this."

TABLE 20-A (continued)

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"To make a similar workshop more effective next time, I would recommend:"[a]

3.	Increase the amount of group discussion time. (continued)
	Response Examples: "More small group activities in which participants can really get into the issues."

[a] Number of respondents=39

TABLE 21-A

Summary of Workshop Participants' Responses to the Question:
"The one thing I feel would be useful from Project BORN FREE to help me implement changes in my institution is:"[a]

---

1. Materials concerning career-related sex-role stereotyping.

   Response Examples:
   - "The modules and the activities dealing with change and implementing change."
   - "Sample evaluation instruments--assessing attitudes."
   - "Use of the tape 'World of Options;' Project BORN FREE's office as a resource."
   - "The statistics--the evidence you have provided. Staff will hear that!"

2. Continued contact with workshop participants.

   Response Examples:
   - "Continued communication among the project participants at least at our own level."
   - "To involve me in some monthly or quarterly review-report-support session to keep concern and enthusiasm high."
   - "An occasional seminar or reunion as support and to give new ideas on dealing with problems in institution--as well as sharing successes."

3. Assistance from Project BORN FREE staff as consultants and resource persons.

   Response Examples:
   - "To have a resource person available in the project to call when I would need some assistance in implementing the plan."
   - "To keep in contact with people in the BORN FREE office at the University."
   - "I would like to have an open line of communication with 'BORN FREE' staff."
   - "Support, assistance with implementation from staff; update on available resources."

4. Periodic distribution of a written communication or newsletter.

   Response Examples:
   - "Some kind of continued correspondence or reminders to ask us what we've done, where we are, and where we're going."
   - "Periodic reports from BORN FREE office and a 'round robin' letter of participants of things they have actually accomplished about which they feel proud and which they would recommend to others."
   - "Newsletter or some on-going input to keep me going, encouraged, and inspired."

---

[a] Number of respondents=38

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Christian Brothers Retreat Center
Stillwater, Minnesota

Retreat Agenda - June 18, 1977

8:30 - 9:00	Name Tags and Career Mixer
9:00 - 9:30	BORN FREE Overview Introduction of Staff
9:30 - 10:30	Getting Acquainted: Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development
10:30 - 10:50	Break
10:50 - 12:00	Collage Painting and Presentation
12:00 - 2:00	Lunch and Recreating
2:00 - 3:00	Communication Exercise/Career Life Line
3:00 - 3:10	Break
3:10 - 5:00	Decision-Making Exercise/Group Process
5:00 - 6:00	Social Hour
6:00 - 7:00	Dinner
7:00 - 7:45	Role Reversal
7:45 - 8:40	Judging Collages
8:40 - 8:50	Dramatic Reading
8:50 - 9:00	Debriefing

OUTLINE: BORN FREE SUMMER INSTITUTE

June 18 - July 1, 1977

Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping

Sunny Hansen, Warren Shaffer, Bev Mills, Doug Pelcak, Anne Boe, Gerri Perreault, Barb Lofgren, Terri Teeson. Evaluators: Dennis Keierleber, Sue Warsett. Media: Phyllis Kragseth

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES:

Participants will: Increase their awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors regarding sex-roles and of the relationship between sex-role socialization and career options.

Experience a content/process model of in-service training which they can adapt in developing their own implementation plans.

Increase their knowledge of programs and change process through which they can reduce sex-role stereotyping in their own institutions.

Expand their concept of career development education to include education, occupation, and lifestyle options in a developmental framework.

Develop ways to increase the involvement of parents, students, and community to reduce career realted sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions.

Become familiar with efforts of business and industry to develop personnel strategies for opening career options for women and men.

Sat., June 18 RETREAT - Christian Brothers Retreat Center, Stillwater

WEEK I:

Mon., June 20	8:00- 9:00	Registration, Fraser Hall
	9:00- 9:30	Retreat recap--workshop overview (grades, texts, tapes, journals, etc.)
	9:30-10:00	Pre-test
	10:00-10:30	Module Activity (Content)--Defining Career Development Terms
	10:30-11:30	Career Development Conceptual Framework
	11:30-12:00	Discussion
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 1:30	Psycho-Social Visit Orientation
	1:30- 2:30	Module Activity (Process--DGG)--Girls/Women Should and Boys/Men Should
	2:30- 3:50	Team Planning or Tape Viewing (read systems diagnosis, review packet at your level)
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections (include reactions to readings)

Tues., June 21	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:00	Literature review--Elementary
	10:00-10:20	Break
	10:20-12:00	Literature review--Secondary and Higher Education
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 1:30	Videotape - "A World of Options"
	1:30- 2:15	Videotape evaluation and discussion
	2:15- 2:45	Instructions for videotape viewing - "Video Tape Festival"
	2:45- 3:50	Group Process Guidelines for Workshop Leaders
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections
Wed., June 22	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:15	Assertion Training and Sex-Role Stereotyping
	10:15-10:35	Break
	10:35-11:20	Assertion Training (cont.)
	11:20-12:00	Module Activity (Process--DGG)--"Family Tree"
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 2:00	Module Activity (Content)--"Change Mode Exercise"
	2:00- 3:50	Team planning or tape viewing
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections
Thurs., June 23	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:15	Illustrative Programs (Elementary, Secondary, Higher Education-Post Secondary)
	10:15-10:30	Break
	10:30-12:00	Illustrative Programs (cont.)
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 2:00	Module Activity (Process--DGG)--"Joe Househusband"
	2:00- 3:50	Team planning or tape viewing
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections
Fri., June 24	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:00	Conceptual Model to Bring About Change
	10:00-10:15	Resistance to Change
	10:15-10:35	Break
	10:35-11:15	Becoming Change Agents-discussion with practitioners-BORN FREE Staff
	11:15-12:00	Module Activity (Content)-Force Field Analysis
WEEK II:		
Mon., June 27	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:15	How to Deal with Administrators
	10:15-10:35	Break
	10:35-11:30	Announcements
	11:30-12:00	Evaluating Your Activities
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 2:00	Module Activity (Content)-Textbook/Publications Analysis
	2:00- 3:50	Team Planning - Tape Viewing
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections

Tues., June 28	9:00-10:20	Videotape: Men's support group and Women's support group
	10:20-10:45	Discussion of video
	10:45-11:45	Module Activity-Using Resources
	11:45- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 4:00	Psycho-Social Visit Visit Evaluations Reflections
Wed., June 29	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:00	Share psycho-social visits
	10:00-10:20	Break
	10:20-11:00	Module activities review/evaluation
	11:00-12:00	Module Activity (Process--DGG) "Magic Seminar"
	12:00- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 3:50	Work on implementation plan or tape viewing
	3:50- 4:00	Journal reflections
Thurs., June 30	8:30- 9:00	Materials browsing
	9:00-10:00	Module Activity (Process--DGG)--"Physical Continuum"
	10:00-10:15	Break
	10:15-11:15	Catchup Session Relating Career Education to developmental approaches Vocational interest tests Sex-role identity development
	11:15-12:00	Module Activity (Content)--"Commitment to Change--Waves or Ripples"
	12:00- 2:00	Lunch
	2:00- 3:30	Team planning or tape viewing (turn in final response to videotapes)
	3:30- 4:00	Final journal reflections (collect, read)
Fri., July 1	8:30-10:30	Present implementation plans (by levels)
	10:30-10:45	Break
	10:45-12:00	Evaluation and Post Test
		Adjourn